

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 11.

FEBRUARY, 1926.

VOL. XV.

IN MEMORIAM

WILLIAM MAURICE PRYKE

WE record with no ordinary sense of loss the death of William Maurice Pryke, B.D., Rector of Risby, who died on January 31st in his thirty-ninth year. The son of Chancellor Pryke, of Exeter Cathedral, he was educated at Sherborne School and at Merton College, Oxford. He obtained Second Class Honours in Theology in 1910, and proceeded to his B.D. in 1916. After leaving Oxford he studied Theology at Marburg University, and there started on those lines of thought which he pursued during the rest of his life. His first curacy, 1910—1915, he served under Canon Garbett at Portsea. His next curacy was at All Hallows, Barking, under Canon A. W. Robinson. He became Vicar of Bradninch, Devon, in 1918, and in 1921 exchanged this parish for St. Aidan's, South Shields. At South Shields he worked beyond his physical powers. Having strained his heart, he was warned by his doctor that he must seek lighter work. Lord Chancellor Haldane in 1924 presented him to Risby, a rural parish in Suffolk. Here after fifteen months of happy work he died. His dying days were characterized by a wonderful joyousness, based on his strong faith in the love and presence of God.

Those who were present at last year's Modern Churchmen's Conference at Oxford are not likely to forget Maurice Pryke's paper on 'Modernism and Life after Death.' It was characterized not only by sound learning and great expository power, but also by a certain ruthless courage which refused to use traditionalist language, ambiguous phrases, and obsolete arguments in support of the doctrine of a future life. No doubt many will

turn to that paper again, and will note that while one untenable position after another is abandoned by the writer, yet he maintains triumphantly the faith in life eternal beyond the tomb. His paper concluded with these words :

‘ The Christian to-day will go for his pictures of the after-life rather to the utterances of the great poets, than to the flamboyant imaginings of Hebrew Apocalyptic, and concentrating his thought on heaven as being beyond all else fellowship with a Person, will declare himself at once incurably agnostic and supremely confident in face of death’s adventure, being content to say with Tennyson :

“ For though from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.”

or with John Masfield :

“ Death opens unknown doors. It is most grand to die.”

Maurice Pryke’s death affirmed and confirmed his teaching about death. There was a note of joyous triumph in it. We cite but one characteristic utterance. When, in reply to his enquiry, his wife told him that he was dying, he said : ‘ I had no idea how wonderful it would be.’

Although only fifteen months at Risby, he had won the regard of his parishioners. The enlarged congregation, the well-trained choir, the improved church arrangements testified to this. He was a faithful parish priest, but he strove to be more : a zealous student, he used his knowledge to help those outside his parish. He was a regular and valued contributor, especially of reviews, to the *Modern Churchman*. Able articles by him were also published in the *Pilgrim*, *Interpreter*, and *Review of the Churches*. He was not only a member of the Council of the Churchmen’s Union, but also the Honorary Librarian of the Union. This office entailed a heavy correspondence in answer to queries as to courses of reading, authorities to be recommended in the preparation of papers on special subjects, books suitable for teachers, etc. He found time and energy to produce a book, *Modernism as a Working Faith*, published by Heffer’s last year. It constitutes a convincing reply to those who commonly assert that the Modernist presentation of the Christian Religion is unsuited to the needs and understanding of the ordinary man. The simple Christian believer, Maurice Pryke asserted, ‘ is at heart potentially, if not actually and avowedly, a thorough-going Modernist.’

The Modernists in this country are deeply conscious of the gap which his departure has left in their ranks. He was essentially a working Modernist. In the last few years death has deprived our cause of many whose gifts and graces and labours and examples have done much to make Modernism the influence and power which it is to-day, and of these, last but not least, is our fellow-worker Maurice Pryke.

He married in 1917, Olave, daughter of the late Herbert Preston-Thomas, C.B., and leaves behind a wife as brave and devoted as he was himself, and three little girls. H.D.A.M.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Modernism and the Mission Field.

The *Church Times* in its issue of January 29th publishes a three-column leader on 'Modernism and the Mission Field,' which is calculated to increase the alarm of Anglo-Catholics at the sinister character of English Modernism. We may cite the following sentences to illustrate this :

'If an interview could be arranged between Mohammed and Dr. Major, their differences of opinion concerning Christ would not be serious.'

'A coalition therefore [the "therefore" refers to a statement made by the late Dean Rashdall] between Mohammedans and Modernists is quite conceivable.'

We do not propose here to discuss these far-fetched hypotheses, but the following statement of which the article is largely an expansion :

'To test the value of the creed of Christendom and Modernist theology as missionary religions, we must contrast their respective principles. The foundation of historic Christianity is the doctrine that there are personal distinctions within the being of Deity. These personal distinctions are not mere external appearances displayed to man. They are what God is eternally within Himself.'

This statement as to the foundation of historic Christianity may satisfy a dogmatic theologian, although it might create difficulties for a Christian philosopher, especially if these 'personal distinctions' be interpreted, as they usually are by Traditionalists, as three personalities; but what is quite certain is that this kind of teaching will puzzle the plain man, whether he be pagan or Christian. Victor Whitechurch, in that interesting book *Concerning Himself—the Story of an Ordinary Man*,* thus

* Published by T. Fisher Unwin.

describes the effect of a Trinity Sunday sermon based on this foundation of personal distinctions within the being of Deity :

' I screwed up my boyish attention to take it in, and came away with the impression that it was very bewildering and the conception of Three separate Gods sitting upon three Thrones, and demanding to be called One . . . But I breathed a breath of relief when the big preacher told us it was a mystery that even *he* could not understand, and, in accordance with his exhortation, I made up my mind stoutly to believe the incomprehensible.'

Dean Swift speaks of ' the *probabo, probabo* of a Trinity Sunday sermon ' and of its tedious and unconvincing effect, and most laymen will agree with him. When the *Church Times* assails Modernists because they do not propose to teach non-Christians that this metaphysical subtlety is ' the foundation of historic Christianity,' it is exhibiting more zeal than knowledge. What the *Church Times* is insisting on is not a foundation of the Christian Religion, but a deduction of Catholic Theology, which whether it be true or false ought not to be presented as a foundation truth. We know of no English Modernists who would not declare for Trinitarian orthodoxy as against Arianism or Sabellianism, but they would not think of raising the issue in their teaching. The wise missionary will begin with the Christian Religion, and the foundation of the Christian Religion is that mankind does possess a supreme unveiling of the Divine Nature in the personality and teaching of Jesus Christ.

It might gratify a missionary of the *Church Times* type to receive the answer which a Chinese convert gave to the question, ' What do you believe to be the unique truth in the Christian Religion?' He replied, ' The Christian Religion is quite different from the Chinese, because it teaches that God is three in one and one in three.' The Modernist missionary would prefer the answer to be that God is love. If that truth can be accepted by the convert as the great working hypothesis of the Christian Religion, the life and conduct of him who accepts it will begin to give moral evidence of its worth, but he who is won to accept the metaphysical formula that ' God is three in one, and one in three,' is not moved thereby to strive after a moral and spiritual ideal.

The *Church Times* has raised the issue of Modernist missions to Mohammedans. We would reply briefly that the English Modernist is heart and soul with Raymond Lull, the noblest

of mediaeval missionaries to Islam, and a martyr for the Faith (1315 A.D.). Lull laid down as a fundamental principle of his missionary propaganda that :

‘ That religion is the true religion which holds the highest and most perfect conception of God. ’

This was the way in which he reasoned as a Christian missionary desirous of winning Mohammedans to the Christian Faith.

‘ When we examine the Allah of Mohammed, although there be Righteousness and Wisdom visible in Him, there is no Love to be found ; but when we examine the Christian Religion we see clearly that in it God is unveiled as love. Now the conception of God as love is the highest and most perfect conception we can have of God, and therefore the Religion of Christ is to be accepted in preference to the Religion of Mohammed. ’

Lull, moreover, had no thought of limiting the Divine Mercy or of terrifying people into acceptance of the Christian Faith. After his death the Inquisitor-General in Aragon, at the instigation of the Dominicans, charged him with teaching :

‘ That Jews and Saracens who believe in all good faith and do not sin mortally, can be saved. ’

The Vanishing Clergyman.

The ordination statistics for the year 1925 reveal a very serious state of affairs. The number of deacons ordained for work at home was 392 ; in 1924 it was 477 ; in 1914 (including one war ordination) it was 503. Of last year’s ordinands 251, or practically 65 per cent. of the whole number ordained were graduates : 40 per cent. of the ordinands were graduates of Oxford or Cambridge. In other words, Oxford and Cambridge supplied 156 ordinands, and all other Universities 95. We do not know what percentage of these had taken Honour degrees or of what class, but there is reason to fear that there has been a falling off here also. There has also been a great falling off in the number of ordinands from the Public Schools. On the other hand, recent statistics show that in the post-war period there has been a great increase in the number of boys at the English public schools. Statistics also show that a public school education costs a good deal more than in pre-war days.

These facts entirely support Dr. Headlam’s comment on the Report of the Committee appointed by the Archbishops to investigate the Supply of Candidates for Holy Orders, published in 1925. The main point in the Bishop of Gloucester’s comment ran as follows :

'The real problem is: 'Why a large number of persons who have a certain amount of private means and, therefore, are, to a certain extent, independent of the financial position, used to take Orders and do not do so now? That is the problem before us.'

The Bishop's answer is that it is due to the secularization of our modern life. This arises partly from an intellectual atmosphere, which, as the Bishop very truly indicates, is not one of *disbelief*, but of *uncertainty*. This *uncertainty* leads to the lowering of moral standards and to the increase of materialism in society generally. Pleasure-seeking and money-making become the engrossing interests of young men and young women. Idealism is at a discount. In such a social atmosphere ordinands must needs be few.

But why should *uncertainty* about the Christian Religion be on the increase? The pessimistic writer of *Ecclesiastes* said, 'He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow,' but ought the increase of knowledge to produce an increase of scepticism? That was not the view of Francis Bacon, but just the opposite.

Nevertheless, the increase of knowledge is undoubtedly producing an increase of scepticism in our younger people, and this is because the presentation of the Christian religion is out of date in our Prayer Book, in our Hymn Books, in our pulpits, in our confirmation classes, day schools, and Sunday schools. The absurd and fanatical emphasis which the traditionalist clergy and the bitter and obscurantist Church press place upon the outworn forms of traditional Christian dogmas and upon interpretations of them, which are discredited in the minds of modern men, is doing a tremendous amount to create a feeling of uncertainty, if not of absolute scepticism. No Church policy could be more injudicious in this age and country. Yet here we have the Church itself doing not a little towards creating that spirit of secularism which the Bishop deplores, and so indirectly promoting that secularization of English education in all its stages, and particularly at Oxford and Cambridge, which he asserts are 'largely secular and to a considerable extent even hostile to Christianity' (p. 29).

This last statement is, in our judgment, much too strong. The atmosphere of the older Universities is strongly anti-ecclesiastical, but it is latently Christian. There are few among the most agnostic dons who do not love those things that Jesus loved, and would not be drawn to active membership in the

Christian Church if it had more of the spirit and works of Jesus in it. Be that as it may, the clergy and the clerical calling have largely lost their interest for the modern-minded laity.

The reasons, however, for the shortage of clergy are not simply intellectual and moral, although such we believe them mainly to be. We may not wisely ignore the financial aspect. There are certainly some men who desire to be ordained and would be excellent clergymen, but they cannot afford the expense. Unless the Church will help them financially they must seek other occupations. A number of these men are lost to the Church's ministry annually. The policy of increasing the income of benefices and providing pensions for the clergy is not going to relieve the scarcity of ordinands, at least for some years to come. As a consequence, the Church will have to depend more and more on the services of lay-workers, and to reduce the number of its superfluous parochial services and organizations. Meanwhile the work of Prayer Book revision, doctrinal restatement, and an improved system of religious education, will provide ordinands for the future. Only let the Church authorities stand firm and resolutely refuse to lower the standard; good acolytes do not make the kind of clergymen who carry weight in English life. Let the future clergy be trained as far as possible in the free and vigorous intellectual atmosphere of our Universities; thus will they best learn to influence our educated classes, and through them the nation.

An Episcopal Defence of Modernism.

The *Yorkshire Observer* of February 1st reports an address on Modernism given by Dr. Perowne, Bishop of Bradford. The report is not *verbatim*, and so particular phrases in it must not be pressed, but it indicates in a very cheering way the Bishop's attitude in this matter. The Bishop opened by saying that he did not call himself an extreme Modernist. There were wise Modernists and there were unwise Modernists, and the latter would cut away the whole basis of the Christian religion. The Modernist in theological matters stood in contrast to the Traditionalist. The Traditionalist did not allow any authority to science or historical criticism when they conflicted with Church Tradition. Traditionalists were of two kinds, Biblical traditionalists and ecclesiastical traditionalists. The first had complete

confidence in the infallibility of the Bible; the second in the infallibility of the Church.

The Bishop added that :

He wished to say nothing of either section except that both were making the same error of mistaking the scaffolding for the building. It could not be really necessary to have either the Bible or the Church as their ultimate authority when they knew that the early Christians had neither.

The Modernist did not deny the value of the Bible or the Church, but he insisted on his right to the use of his own God-given reason. The Modernist refused to take religion upon mere external authority, whether of Church or Bible. The reformers went to the stake for the sake of liberty of conscience and independence of thought.

In the words of Dr. Sanday, Modernists stood for unification of thought, which meant that they might use the same processes of thought in thinking both of secular things and sacred things.

The Modernist taught that the Divine Revelation is progressive. Its progressive character is seen in the gradual transformation of the terrible tribal deity of the early Hebrews into the loving Father revealed in Jesus Christ.

The Christian Religion as understood by the Modernist was neither negative nor static; it was positive, free, adventurous—the response of the human child to the inspiration of the Divine Father.

If our Bishops would speak out much more definitely on these fundamental questions, the whole English Church would pass naturally, and to a large extent harmoniously, under their leadership into the possession of a modern theology which would gain the adhesion of the rising generation.

The Watford Conference, Dr. Furse, and Occasional Communion.

A conference of three hundred Anglicans, Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, arranged to meet at Watford on the 28th January in connection with the Faith and Order Movement, had to be abandoned at the last moment owing to the refusal of the Bishop of St. Albans to sanction at it the celebration of the Holy Eucharist to which all the members of the Conference were invited.

Seeing that the special object of the Faith and Order Conferences is to promote the reunion of Christendom, and that the subjects assigned for consideration to this particular Conference were Baptism and the Eucharist, it is hard to conceive of a more suitable occasion for a united service of Holy Communion.

Occasional communion by Nonconformists is of long standing in the English Church and has been regarded as legitimate by many in authority. It was sanctioned by such notable prelates as Archbishop Tait, Archbishop Temple, Archbishop Benson, Archbishop Maclagan, Archbishop Magee, Bishop Creighton, the late Bishop of St. Albans (Dr. Jacob) and many others. To refuse to permit it on the occasion of the Watford Conference is a seriously retrogressive step, and marks the reactionary character of a Church policy which presents Catholicism as possessed of a rigid sectarian temper instead of being essentially comprehensive and loving.

The rubric in the Prayer Book which requires Confirmation before admission to Holy Communion refers not to Protestant Dissenters, whether English or foreign, but to those who have been baptized in accordance with the English Prayer Book Baptismal Service, which requires the English Confirmation Service for its completion. It is therefore as amazing as it is unfortunate that the present Bishop of St. Albans should have acted as he has done.

The Rev. G. H. Ruffell Laslett, the Free Church co-secretary of the Watford Conference, expressed in an interview not only what Free Churchmen, but also what many Anglicans, feel about this unhappy incident :

‘ Our difficulty as Nonconformists is to know just what the position of the Church of England is, for whilst there are many like the Vicar of Watford, who are willing that Nonconformists should sit with them at the Lord’s Table, there are others who, like the Bishop of St. Albans, object to it. Until the Church of England has made up her mind as a whole on such a vital issue, it is very difficult for us to discuss the question of reunion. If the Nonconformists have no right to the Lord’s Table, then the question is not only of re-ordination of Nonconformist ministers, but of “reconversion” of members of Nonconformist Churches.

‘ The Anglican section of the Lambeth Committee, which has been discussing reunion with the Nonconformist Churches, definitely states that Nonconformist Churches are branches of the true Church, but since the true Church can only be one, he who is a member in any one branch is also a member in every other.

‘ We do not want to “force” the hands either of the Bishop or of the Church of England, but what we do want is a clear statement of the position.’

We should be grateful if the Primate would tell us in this matter what things are ‘lawful and honest.’ In the light of Dr. Furse’s action we seem to be further from Reunion than we were fifty years ago.

A MODERN SURVEY OF THE ATONEMENT

By the Rev. A. E. N. HITCHCOCK, M.A., Vicar of Hickling, Norwich.

I.

STRICTLY speaking, the word atonement is not a New Testament word, the only passage in which it occurs in the Authorised Version having been deliberately altered by the Revisers to 'reconciliation' (*Rom.* v, 11). Call it, however, by whatever name we will, the fact of the At-one-ment between God and man, and man and God, through Jesus Christ has always stood as the foundation-stone of our Faith. Christianity is first and foremost a religion of Atonement.

Modern preachers often speak of our Lord as a great teacher, a reformer, a philanthropist; but all these aspects of His Person and ministry, true and valuable as they are, are very little stressed in the Apostles' teaching, and pale into insignificance before the central fact that He came as the world's Redeemer, 'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.'

It would be superfluous in the present case to give instances from the four Gospels and the Epistles, as well as from the very structure of the Gospels themselves, of the importance of our Lord's death and passion in His own mind and in those of His apostles. It is enough to say that the Cross and all that it implies was then, and has been ever since, the centre round which Christian doctrine has been built. It has often been said that the strength of the Roman Catholic Church is the focussing of her worship on the ceremony which above all 'proclaims the Lord's death till He come'; and it is equally true to say that the success of the Salvation Army does not rest on its philanthropic activities; it has flourished because the message that 'Christ died for our sins' is shouted at street corners, blared forth on the cornet, and banged out on a big drum. No form of Christianity can ignore the Atonement and survive for any considerable time.

II.

When, however, Christian teachers have attempted to interpret and explain the fact of the Atonement, various and even contradictory theories have been put forward; and it is the purpose of this paper to try to review and comment upon some of those theories.

(i) It was not until the latter part of the second century (by which time the canon of the New Testament had become practically fixed, so that at least the majority of its books were available for purposes of study and evidence to the whole Church) that the first attempt to formulate a theory of the Atonement was made. It was Irenaeus who seized upon the word 'ransom' in the sentence 'the Son of Man is come to give His life a ransom for many' and found in it the key-word to the whole problem. A ransom, argued Irenaeus and those who elaborated his theory, must be paid *to* someone *by* someone else. If the death of Christ was a ransom, who paid it? The answer was, God. To whom was it paid? The answer was, to the devil. By paying the devil the life of Jesus, God secures man's release from the captivity of Satan.

This line of reasoning was so clear and sounded so simple that it held the field in Christian theology for nearly a thousand years. It was made (to our minds) grotesque by further elaborations such as that of Rufinus (evidently a forerunner of Isaac Walton!), who metaphorically pictures God as angling to catch the devil with the body of our Saviour as the bait. Similarly, Gregory of Nyssa describes Satan as being caught on the hook of Christ's Divinity, which had been concealed in His Humanity; and to Peter Lombard the Cross was a trap baited with Christ's blood!

(ii) It was not until the twelfth century that an alternative to this 'ransom' theory of the Atonement was put forward by Anselm, who wrote his famous treatise to answer the question which constitutes its title, *Cur Deus Homo?*—Why did God become man? Anselm's key-word was the word 'debt': man owes obedience to God; by sin he has failed to pay what is due, and so has become God's debtor. The debt could only be discharged by the Son of God, who 'for us men and for our salvation' became man and suffered death on the cross. In this way God's honour is satisfied and man redeemed.

Anselm's theory, it will be seen, differs essentially from that which had gone before in that the price is paid this time, not to the devil, but to God.

(iii) In this respect Anselm was followed by the leading theologians of the Reformation. But as the age of chivalry which may have suggested Anselm's metaphor of a debt of honour had passed—(we might also have mentioned the possibility of Irenaeus' emphasis on 'ransom' having been suggested by acquaintance with the banditti of Asia Minor)—so the Reformers thought of God rather in terms of Tudor despotism, or its equivalent in the sixteenth century tyrants of mid-European states. Thus the word 'propitiation' became the key-word of this theory and the starting-point of their interpretation.

According to Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, and other Reformers, God is a great Ruler, and men having broken His laws must be punished; if the transgressor is not punished, then God's anger must be propitiated by someone else suffering in his place. The Son of God therefore comes down to earth to suffer in His Person the punishment which should rightly fall on us. It is as if a king, about to storm a rebellious city, is persuaded to stay his hand by a close relative or friend of his in the city offering his life in exchange for those of all the other citizens, like the six citizens of Calais. Expressions such as 'appeasing the wrath of God' are typical of this school, which has been followed in this country and U.S.A. more by Free Churchmen than by Anglican theologians and preachers.

(iv) The seventeenth century saw a partial revolt from the above theory, with the result that the defence of the Atonement was taken up anew by a Dutch lawyer, Hugo Grotius, who like Anselm before him attempted to restate the case in his treatise on *The Satisfaction of Christ*.

Grotius, although he uses much of the language of the Reformers, would not admit that our Lord was punished. His sufferings were not penal, but illustrative. God, he said, is the moral governor of the universe, whose laws cannot be broken with impunity. Unless sin were punished the dignity of God's government would be destroyed. Christ, the sinless One, alone could pay the price of sin and thus enable man to be forgiven without prejudice to the Divine justice. This, called usually the 'governmental' theory, takes the word 'justice' for its key-

note and has influenced the Anglican Church more than any other theory of the Atonement.

‘There was none other good enough
To pay the price of sin;
He only could unlock the gate
Of Heaven, and let us in’

is our hymnal summary of the governmental theory.

III.

These then are the four theories which, with more or less slight variations, have had most influence on Christian theology hitherto, and before going any further it may be convenient to summarize them as follows:

(i) The ‘*Ransom*’ theory (end of second century). Key-word, ‘*ransom*’; distinctive idea, God redeeming man from the devil.

(ii) The ‘*Commercial*’ theory (eleventh century). Key-word, ‘*debt*’; distinctive idea, the honour of God vindicated by the Saviour paying the debt incurred by human sin.

(iii) The *Penal-Satisfaction* theory (sixteenth century). Key-word, ‘*propitiation*’; distinctive idea, God appeased by Christ’s punishment in our place.

(iv) The *Governmental* theory (seventeenth century). Key-word, ‘*justice*’; distinctive feature, the object of Christ’s death to satisfy, not God’s honour, nor His anger, so much as His moral government.

All these theories have had their value. The fact that each seems to have been coloured to some extent by the ideas and associations of its age only shows that it was an honest attempt to explain the unchanging fact of the Atonement in terms that each age could comprehend. And yet, because we think quite differently now, these theories seem to us to be too mechanical, or too artificial, or too immoral. Each seems to have seized upon a single metaphor or idea and to have built upon that alone, rather than upon all that our Lord and His disciples taught about God’s dealings with mankind. As Bishop Westcott said:

‘each view is essentially incomplete, and it is perilous to attempt to draw conclusions from limited interpretations of Scripture’ (*Ep. to Hebs.*, p. 300).

The one test to apply to all theology is, what does it teach us about God? And it is here that these theories seem to be so

inadequate. To begin with the latest, the 'governmental' theory seems to draw too much on political analogy in its doctrine of God. The moral government of the universe is conceived of as an objective reality to which God Himself stands in the relation of a kind of magistrate. Yet the governmental theory is surely preferable to the rather terrible Calvinistic notion of God being appeased with sacrifices, a conception really pre-Christian and heathenish; or to Anselm's theory, of which it has been said that it suggests too strongly a Shylock demanding his pound of flesh. The 'ransom' theory we are bound to dismiss from serious consideration as grotesque: we can hardly imagine God 'doing a deal' with Satan.

Leaving this theory then out of account, it would seem that the rest, apart from other weaknesses, lose sight of the great fact of our religion, that God reveals Himself fully and perfectly in Jesus Christ. Rather they seem to imply a contrast between God and Christ. This is how an American writer (C. E. Jefferson in *Doctrine and Deed*) describes his own experience of such doctrines and the impression they made on him:

'When I was a boy, I thought that God was a strict and solemn and awful King, who was very angry because men had broken His law. He was just, and His justice had no mercy in it. Christ, His Son, was much better-natured and more compassionate, and He came forth into our world to suffer on the cross that God's justice might relax a little and His heart be opened to forgive our race. When I became a young man, I supposed that this was the teaching of the Christian religion. My heart rebelled against it. I would not accept it. I became an infidel. *A man cannot accept a doctrine of God that does not appeal to the best that is in him.*' (Italics mine.)

He then goes on to describe how he learnt later what he thought was a new doctrine, but which was really a very old doctrine which all this time had lain half-hidden, sometimes more than half-revealed, in the long centuries of Christianity.

But before we unearth this old doctrine of the Atonement let us clear the ground a little further; and to do that we must rake out even more thoroughly the old systems which have 'had their day and ceased to be.'

Words like 'ransom,' 'propitiation' and 'debt' have formed the basis of inadequate theories simply because these metaphors have been taken literally and in isolation and then pressed to their logical conclusions. It has been suggested from time to

time that if these words were regarded merely as figures of speech a great deal of the superstructure which they have supported would disappear. For instance, we might speak at the present time of a mother's sacrifice for her children. The word 'sacrifice' is here used as the equivalent to 'unselfishness'; but if we argue on the analogy of sacerdotal rites and ask 'for what is the sacrifice?' and 'to whom is it offered?' we spoil the value of the metaphor. Yet this is what Irenaeus, Anselm, Calvin and Grotius appear to have done in their theories of the Atonement. They have substituted for God revealed in the fulness of His love their own mechanical transactions.

Where in the parable of the prodigal son do we find that the father has to be propitiated, or compensated, before he can forgive the sinner? Where do we read of a ransom having to be paid—presumably to a hungry wolf!—before the lost sheep can be restored to the fold? And if we are told that *we* should forgive until seventy times seven, cannot our Heavenly Father do as much?

IV.

But we must pause again. You will say that this paper has contradicted itself. After opening with the strongest possible emphasis on the value of the Atonement, it may seem that all we have done so far has been to disparage it. Unless we can remove such an impression all we have said will be useless. No criticism is worth much until it is able to rebuild on the old foundations a better edifice than that which it has demolished.

The keystone of the new edifice is '*union with God*,' which is the more closely akin to the generally-accepted meaning of the word 'Atonement' (at-one-ment) than are any of the rest. The holiness and the love of God form the basis of our building. The whole Bible leads us on gradually to this conception, which is consummated by God's final revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ. 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself'; 'So God loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son'; 'God commendeth His love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.'

In other words, God, who is Love, invisible, eternal, united Himself with us in Christ who is the Word (*λογος*), the expression of God in human form; and we, uniting ourselves

with Christ, become at one with the Father. By penitence, by prayer, by sacrament, and through all these by lives of unselfish usefulness and genuineness, we become at one with Him.

Union with God is becoming increasingly the core of the Church's message to-day. Bishop Westcott, probably more than any other modern theologian, has emphasized this truth, which combines the objective with what might otherwise be considered, and has sometimes been criticized as, too subjective a view of the Atonement. Another criticism which this view may have to meet is that it lays less emphasis on the death of Christ than does the teaching of the Apostles. To that criticism we would reply that by the death of Christ God becomes the sin-bearer of the world. He bears our sins on His mind and heart, as well as 'in His own body, on the tree.'

It has been truly said that there are three conceptions of God—the savage, the pagan, and the Christian.

(a) According to the savage conception God is a vengeful and capricious tyrant. We have outgrown that.

(b) According to the pagan idea He is indifferent to the wants and woes of man. He stands aloof, feeling no pain and sorrow. Much of the vague semi-unitarian religion that we meet with to-day goes little, if any, further than this.

(c) But according to the Christian idea God suffers: He bears our sorrows and sins because He shares them; 'The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.' And nothing but the Cross could ever have shown us that.

It may be objected that all this boils down to sympathy; it would be truer to say that it leads up to sympathy, for sympathy is love, and love is the greatest thing in all the world:

'Just as I am; thy love unknown
Hath broken every barrier down:
Now to be Thine, yea Thine alone,
O Lamb of God, I come.'

There this paper must end. It has merely reviewed some aspects of the Atonement. Its opinions make no claim to be either original or final. If there is one idea more than another at the back of the writer's mind it is to show that inability to hold any of what might still be called the 'popular' theories of the Atonement may not be incompatible with a firm and, if one may say so, an ever-increasing belief in the central and eternal truths of the Christian Faith.

A GOOD FRIDAY DREAM

By the Rev. C. M. CHAVASSE, M.C., M.A., Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford,
and Examining Chaplain to the Bishops of Oxford and Bristol.

THE services of Good Friday were over. Too tired to study, I cast myself down and took up my *Pilgrim's Progress*, that sure refreshment for a weary mind. As my eye travelled over the familiar pages, I felt myself drawn into the tale, till it seemed to be I myself that knocked at the Wicket Gate and entered the narrow way and visited the wonders of the Interpreter's House. Soon I found myself ascending that straight path, fenced on either side by the wall called 'Salvation,' up which burdened Christian ran, not without great difficulty by reason of the load upon his back. Till I too arrived at the place, somewhat ascending, where stood a Cross; and where Christian's burden had loosed from off his shoulders, and rolled into the mouth of a sepulchre and was seen no more.

And as I looked and looked again at that Cross, I marvelled that I and my generation were so little oppressed with a sense of sin, and seemed to be unconscious of any burden weighing us down.

Christian, I reflected, was scourged to the Cross fearful of destruction, and wretched with a load of sin. Christiana followed him, haunted by dreams of the black record against her. And yet we, to-day, were 'lightsome and glad,' not because we had experienced the release of forgiveness, as they, but because we did not feel its need.

It was their sense of sin that drove them to the Cross. It takes the Cross to make us wonder about sin at all. And though that Cross may speak to us of the Love of God, did it also make us realize the sin in us, which cost Him the Cross?

I could not but feel uneasy that mine was a generation which lacked a sense of sin, and which also argued that the Saviour did not die to ransom us from sin. The two tendencies must be intimately inter-related, so it seemed to me.

And as I looked, and as thus I thought, I observed a figure, tall and odd-habited, and yet strangely familiar, advancing from the opposite direction. His dress was black and plain. He wore knee-breeches and buckle-shoes. His ruddy face was square and rough-hewn, with sparkling eyes set wide apart. A light moustache did not conceal the firm lines of his mouth. And I

saw that his red curls fell in clusters to his shoulders, as he removed his round hat on catching sight of the Cross. I knew him in a moment, and I cried to him, 'Good Mister Bunyan,' for it was he, 'why did men possess a sense of sin, three hundred years ago, when you wrote your *Pilgrim's Progress*, and we lack it almost entirely to-day, though our sins be none less vile? Why did you, in all sincerity, consider yourself the chiefest of sinners, and drove all your pilgrims up this path, burdened with their guilt? While as we try to tread the pilgrim way, we should not really miss yonder Cross if it were removed. And being removed, we should yet 'skip for joy' as nimbly as did Christian when he had rid him of his load. Is there forgiveness for such as we? Or shall we, like your Ignorance, be cast down to hell from the very gate of heaven itself?

BUNYAN: 'Master Evangelist, for such I perceive by thy habit is thy high calling, I once verily believed there was no hope for a man if he passed not the same judgment upon himself as the Word of God delivers; which tells us that every imagination of his heart is evil, and that his way is crooked and perverse. And, methinks, if the folk of your times did but ponder God's Word as we were wont to devour it, aye with wrestlings and tears, I would boldly affirm that they would see themselves as God sees them, wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked, and would know of a surety the burden of guilt upon their backs.'

Then, as I hung my head in shame, he continued:

'But many things, by the grace of the Prince of Life, have been revealed to me since I passed over to the other side. Of a surety no pilgrim can ever enter the Celestial City unaware to the uttermost of the grievousness of his sin, or of the exceeding great price of salvation paid for him by his Saviour. Yet if, on this side of the river, he has been an earnest pilgrim, believing that Christ died for him, and trusting to Him for righteousness (and that though ignorant in part of sin's terror and salvation's cost), then on the other side there is offered most merciful provision for full penitence, and for complete acceptance through the Blood of the Lord Jesus.'

'But come, good Evangelist, thou shalt see for thyself and so tell thy people.'

Saying which he took me by the hand, and, in the twinkling of an eye, we stood together on the further shore, and watched

the Shining Ones bringing pilgrims up from the River of Death to the gates of the Heavenly City.

Now I saw, when the gates of the city were opened, that within lay a quadrangle, with a great hall on either side, and an inner gate at the further end.

'What are these buildings?' I asked my guide.

'These,' he answered, 'are the Interpreter's House.'

'Why!' I cried, 'there was an Interpreter's House on earth for pilgrims, soon after they had passed in at the Wicket Gate. How strange that it should all be repeated!'

BUNYAN: 'Thou speakest truer than thou knowest. First the Gate, then the Interpreter's House, and after that many another likeness to the pilgrim way on earth, save with two differences, great and glorious, as thou wilt learn bye and bye. But let us enter in with yonder band of the redeemed, and read the riddle for ourselves.'

So we passed through the shining portals and stood before the door of one of the great halls. Over it ran the inscription in golden letters:

THE HALL OF RECKONING.

For every idle word a man shall speak, he shall give an account.

And I noticed, with great searchings of heart, that while the pilgrims entered with eager and radiant faces, yet they came forth weeping; beating upon their breasts and crying, 'God be merciful to me, a sinner.'

Within, the great hall was void of furniture; save where, in the centre, was a pool of water. By its margin sat a grave and reverend person, holding in his hand a bag of small stones, like crystals.

'That' said my companion, pointing to him, 'is the prophet, Nathan, the same who convicted King David of his villainy. Go! Ask him the meaning of this Pool and of those stones in his hand.'

So when I had addressed myself to him, the prophet replied:

'This basin is the Pool of Penitence, and its waters are the tears of the Saints. These crystals are the memories of words or acts of folly. And even as when I cast this stone into the middle of the pool, it raises waves which never cease till they reach the margin; so, pilgrims, remembering a sin, are shown its consequences, which continue till they break against the shores of Eternity.'

At that moment, there came up a pilgrim who gave the name of Pliable, and I rejoiced to see that at length he had broken away from the City of Destruction and had persevered to the gates of the Celestial City itself.

The prophet, Nathan gave him a crystal stone and bade him look therein.

'Ah!' said Pliable, 'I see myself forsaking Christian and turning back home from the Slough of Despond.'

'Let that memory fall into the Pool.' said the prophet.

So he let it fall, and I observed that each wave it created contained pictures, which formed succeeding waves, each one with its pictures, till there seemed no end of them.

I saw in one wave his wife weeping, for she had cherished the secret hope of herself fleeing the City. In another, I saw her growing hard and contented with her surroundings, till in a last wave she died in her sins. I watched his children being jeered at by their companions on account of their turn-coat father, till they came to hate the name of pilgrim, and grew up without God and without hope.

I beheld Mrs. Timorous also, who had even essayed to follow a little way after Pliable. I saw her meet him as he fled back, and return to her house, saying 'If the terrors of the road daunt a man, what hope for a frightened woman?' And I observed in succeeding waves how she became familiar with her neighbours, Mrs. Buteyes and Mrs. Lightmind, and even did her utmost to dissuade Christiana from setting forth with her children.

I saw, likewise, the taverns filled with scoffers against Christian and Pliable alike, so that likely pilgrims were laughed out of their designs; and I noticed in wave after wave the results thereof in wild and reckless lives.

'Ah! woe is me,' cried Pliable, 'I never dreamed the like of this.'

And even as he spoke, an unseen voice was heard praying in tones even sadder than his, 'Father, forgive him, he knew not what he did.'

Then did Pliable's tears rain down upon the pool, and each tear as it splashed into the waters flashed the memory of some forgotten act or word. Each splash also formed its series of never-ending waves with their dreadful pictures. Till his tears fell faster and faster, and ever as he cried out and wept, that

Divine Voice sounded with perpetual intercession, 'Father, forgive him, he knew not what he did.'

The words, and even more the accents of the Voice, still rang in my ears as we crossed the great quadrangle, and following the procession of pilgrims with their shining Ministers, we stood before the threshold of the other Hall on the opposite side. Over this door also was engraved in golden characters its name, and beneath the name its meaning :

THE HALL OF TEKEL.

Thou art weighed in the balances, and found wanting.

The interior gave the impression of a vast portrait gallery. There was, for example, the picture of a choice young man, standing head and shoulders above his attendants. A royal crown girt his noble brows, beneath which looked out earnest and poetic eyes. He was holding the Christ Child in his arms. Beneath ran the inscription :

*Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord,
the Lord hath also rejected thee.*

And, without reading the name, I knew him for King Saul, once destined by God to be the progenitor of that royal race which should give birth to His Son.

Then there hung near it the representation of a Christian missionary being martyred by barbarian heathen, and preaching to them lovingly as he died. The name beneath was 'Judas Iscariot,' and it did not take Mr. Bunyan to explain that I was viewing what God had intended for the traitor apostle.

The other portraits were of the same character, but my attention was arrested by one dominating canvas hanging alone at one end of the gallery. It portrayed the Christ Himself, garbed in peasant's dress, with the tools of a carpenter in His hand, fashioning a Cross. It was guarded by the angels of the Annunciation and the Resurrection, the Messengers of Hope and its Fulfilment, and all the Pilgrims were gazing upon it and its title—'The Perfect Man.' More than once did my guide touch me on the shoulder before I could tear myself away and follow him to the other end of the hall. Here was fixed a great mirror, with the words carved upon the frame, 'All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.'

On the one side of this mirror stood the Angel of the Temptation. He bade the pilgrims look into it one by one, when they

saw themselves, first as God had meant them to be, and then as they really were.

On the other side was the Angel of the Agony, holding in his hand the Cup of Opportunity; that cup which the Saviour had not refused to drain in the Garden of Gethsemane. He proffered the chalice to each pilgrim, filled with all the opportunities they had missed or misused. And as they gazed into its sparkling depths, red with sacrifice, each sparkle recalled some neglected act or wasted chance or postponed decision; till I saw that even such doughty warriors as Great-Heart and Great-Grace wrung their hands, stricken to the heart with shame and remorse.

Then did the Shining Ones approach their charges. They whispered to each, 'Blessed is the man whose unrighteousness is forgiven and whose sin is covered,' and led them from the gallery.

We followed in the train of Pliable, and watched while his attendants conducted him to the Inner Gate of the Quadrangle.

Such a radiance beat from its portals, that even the Shining Ones bent their heads, while mortal eye could not gaze upon it.

But I saw Pliable fall upon his knees, and I thought I saw a Figure bend above him to raise him up with hands that were pierced.

But I could look no more. I turned around, and in turning I woke, and behold it was a dream!

And yet, asleep or awake, I knew I had beheld the truth, and ever in my mind there ran the words of John Bunyan that the life after death was very like the life here, save with two great differences. I realized that I had been shown one of these, namely, that beyond the grave we enter the actual presence of our Saviour. Simply to look on Him, and for Him to look on us, is to know ourselves and to review our lives in the light of His Countenance. The look of Jesus, such as He once cast at Peter, in the Interpreter's House of the Unseen World. It is not now the Cross that tells us of forgiveness and rids us of our sin—it is the actual Voice of the Crucified Himself that pardons us, and His wounded hand that lifts us up.

If now, therefore, we can only know in part the errors of our lives, then shall we know even as also we are known; for now indeed we see as in a glass darkly, but then *face to face*.

THE PROBLEM OF AUTHORITY

By the Rev. CHARLES P. PRICE, B.D., Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral,
Dublin.

THE difficulty of the vast topic thus entitled arises at once from the reality of Authority, and also from its elusiveness. We cannot but be conscious that Authority exists, yet every attempt to focus it, to fix its home, to identify its agents, to determine antecedently the extent of their commission, breaks down on analysis and is discredited by results. We are much more certain that there is what Otto calls a 'Numen' around us than we are about the claim to wield its thunderbolts.

In the sphere of religion Authority is like the atmosphere. It is pervasive. We cannot transcend it. It varies in character and intensity with the spiritual development and receptiveness of those among whom it abides. But when it comes to a question of vesting it in official hands, when men say 'Lo here,' or 'Lo there,' our wisest course still is to believe it not. Authority is an atmosphere rather than a prerogative.

There can be no doubt that the conflicting voices of those who have claimed authority, and their fatal readiness to persecute, have brought the word into disrepute. It speaks of repression, of tyranny, of lofty pretensions which experience has not endorsed, of futile attempts to stay the hand of time and change.

And this has occurred, there is reason to believe, largely because Authority has been hitherto regarded as the coefficient of a religion mainly static and transcendental which has confided to a caste the task of imposing a body of doctrine and a standard of living assumed to be complete, unchanging, and external.

But 'a proposition shot at us,' as Mr. Fawkes observes, 'like a bullet from a pistol, remains a foreign body still'; and if it lodges in our consciousness it is either sterilized there by nature or it sets up a dangerous irritation. Authority must not coerce; it must persuade. Mr. Fawkes goes on to illustrate the difference between these two methods—and, incidentally, between the Latin and the English mind—by comparing the title of the twenty-third psalm as it appears in the Vulgate and in our Prayer-book. In the one case, 'The Lord is my shepherd'; in

the other, 'Dominus regit me.' To drive is the note of a purely transcendental system. In order to lead another factor is required.

What we have to do, then, in order to rehabilitate a force which is considerably discredited is to re-state it, if we can, upon a broader basis; to find a meaning for it in terms of dynamic religion which shall be true to experience, sufficiently elastic to stand, without snapping, the strain of expansion, and thus able to command the loyal adherence of free men. Authority has been despotic; it must become constitutional.

A book which attracted attention a few years ago was entitled by its author *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*. Such a title accepts as fundamental the two elements in religion to which we have alluded, the static and the dynamic, the transcendental and the immanent. It ranges Authority as the characteristic energy of one and sets it in antagonism to the Spirit, regarded as the ruling principle of the other—a relation not unlike that between the Conservative and Radical parties in the State. The implication is, thus, that in Religion you must be either a Ruler or a Rebel, and that the Rebel is right, the Ruler wrong.

It is supposed in some quarters that the nature of Authority is about to become the burning question in theology: if this be so, it is to be hoped that a strenuous campaign will first be directed against this false antithesis; for if it be not false, Authority seems doomed. It can wage but a losing battle against an influence which is bound to absorb the noblest instincts of mankind.

But if we are not to acquiesce in an unresolved dualism we shall be obliged to identify these two, and to conclude that where the Spirit is, there also is Authority. Authority can find no secure foothold except in freedom, in the reason and conscience of mankind. In order to be effective it must be internal. The grounds of submission to it must be acknowledged by the conscience which submits. There is only one way of converting a man—to adapt an adage of Lao-tze—and that is to persuade him to follow the dictates of his own higher nature.

Abandoning, then, *à priori* theories of authority, we find from reflection that it springs from the fact that man possesses a higher nature; that he is conscious of an ideal which he is able

dimly to perceive though not to realize completely. This ideal, like a spectrum, can be split up into its elementary bands of colour, and is found to comprise what Dean Inge calls the absolute values—Truth, Goodness, and Beauty. Authority, then, ultimately, is the force of attraction which these values exert. They make an unconditional claim which, whether we obey it or not, we admit to be indisputable. Not because a council or a book says so, but because our hearts say so.

Now, philosophy becomes religion when its abstractions are clothed in personality: and, as Christians, we believe that all that is good and true and lovely is embodied in Christ. The most stupendous claim to Authority ever put forward is that to be found in the concluding verses of the First Gospel: 'All authority (*ἐξουσία*) is given unto me in heaven and in earth.'

Authority, then, is the effluence of a supreme personality manifested in the hearts and consciences of men. Authority is the pull, like solar attraction, which Christ exercises upon humanity, growing stronger or fainter as His spirit gains or loses power over us.

It is clear, then, that Authority is not, and cannot be, a fixed quantity. Nor is it a species of foreign garrison quartered in an alien land. It is a product of the ground like the harvest, which grows by the kindly ministries of both sun and soil. Is it from Heaven, or of men—your Authority? asked the Chief Priests and elders of our Lord. And He refused to answer: He would not accept their dilemma. Nor should we. For if Authority be from either of these sources exclusively it is naught. In the one case, it fails to reach us; in the other, it has no validity. But if Authority be a relation between Heaven and the human heart, it is a force as enduring as that which governs the tides or holds the planets in their courses. It is the 'imperative of the collective conscience,' diffused through the mass, touched into flame here and there as the Spirit gives men utterance. But, of course, this imperative can neither be absolute nor of universal application. The collective conscience is subject to education and growth. The verdict of the collective conscience is valid for the moment, but it cannot bind the future. As soon almost as it is uttered it begins to be superseded. The days to come will endorse, or correct, or supplement it. Those decisions of the past which we accept to-day

stand, not in virtue of the councils which propounded them, but because they continue to commend themselves to the reason and conscience of this generation.

The idea of God, as has been said, is an endless, growing idea; one age cannot canonize it for posterity. The collective conscience, moreover, is always being modified. From its bosom there spring teachers charged to instruct, to exhort, to warn, and to condemn it; so that Authority transcends itself, and cannot therefore be infallible. The definition of an endless, growing idea is always provisional, never final. Only a church composed of persons perfectly holy and perfectly wise could respond perfectly to the mind of Christ. Inspiration is a real thing; Infallibility a phantom: but a phantom which is always beckoning to the mentally indolent and to the morally weak—a veritable city of refuge for the average man. Probably the claim made by Rome which we find the gravest stumbling-block is precisely the one which endears her most to her own people and attracts those in other communions who are afraid of freedom.

More lip-service is paid to Liberty than to any deity of Olympus, yet none among the gods has so few sincere worshippers. 'Those who wave the Thyrsus are many, but the Initiates are few.'

Where, then, are we to look for the Seat of Authority in religion? If the considerations hitherto adduced be sound, this question will almost answer itself. Authority has no permanent address on earth. It may be found anywhere. The Pope, the Councils, the Bible, the individual conscience, the Church Assembly, a plenary session of Copec—any of these, if the Spirit so wills, may prove to be the instrument of His choice, but none of them has a prescriptive right to be regarded as such, for Authority is not an official endowment, but, in the words of Dr. Goudge, 'the public opinion of a Spirit-bearing body.' The Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and sometimes uses the most unlikely agents. The psalmists and prophets of Israel were not designated by official position, but they were, nevertheless, voices of authority. So it has always been; now a Pope, as in Browning's *Ring and the Book*; now a preacher like Savonarola; again, one outside all the churches. When Emile Zola withstood the Church of France to proclaim the innocence of Dreyfus, the voice of Authority spoke through him. Authority

has many voices, but only one home, and that is in heaven. It has no seat except the Absolute.

It may be argued that there is here a confusion between Authority and Inspiration. But much mischief may be traced to the assumption that they are distinct. If Authority be not inspired, had it not better remain silent? A word of caution is, however, necessary. Inspiration is a very comprehensive term. Are we not in danger of restricting it to the ecstatic and the rhetorical? There is an inspiration of intellect and of the critical faculties as there is of the emotions—an inspiration of selection no less than of creation. It would be a one-sided theory which should deny inspiration to Dr. Driver, for instance, and recognize it in Gipsy Smith.

It is right that every claim and doctrine should be rigidly examined and weighed by experts, to whose verdict Authority undoubtedly attaches. The mistake occurs when this process of discrimination is exclusively regarded as authoritative. Time alone will tell. For the moment it wears another aspect. It more closely resembles the activity of that personage whose office it is, according to the book of *Job*, to try the patience of saints. But then, it may be asked, what good is that to us? How are we to be sure, when controversies arise and expert opinion gives its decision, whether we are to be guided by its finding or not? And the reply must be that we are not to be sure; we are to discover. We all remember an apparently fatuous criterion advanced in *Deuteronomy* for testing the trustworthiness of a prophet. If his message comes true, it may be known that he has been sent by God. That gives no help at the time. At most it suggests suspension of judgment and refers the decision to experience. At first sight it seems a most unsatisfactory answer to a reasonable question; but, on reflection, one perceives that any other reply would have been impossible. Jehovah's messenger cannot be indicated by any external marks. Authority wears no badge. It is a deposit precipitated by the reaction of life and thought upon the problems presented to them.

Athanasius against the world disproves, on the one hand, the claim of majorities to be the voice of God; while, on the other, '*securus judicat orbis terrarum*' sufficiently disposes of the faddist and the crank.

If Authority, then, is so elusive, is there any use, it may be asked, in trying to pursue it? Have these gatherings of scholars and divines no function to fulfil in guarding the purity of the Christian message? That would be a hasty conclusion. No factor is weightier or more august among those by which truth is ultimately determined. Such assemblies, moreover, have the right, which belongs to every corporation, of fixing laws for the government of their society, and terms of communion for its members. Apart from this, their decisions stand or fall according to the intrinsic worth which experience discovers in them. And the steadying effect of such bodies in discountenancing extravagances, and in preserving historical continuity, is as important as it is apparent.

In a well-known essay Matthew Arnold discusses the value of academies. The function of literary criticism, he tells us, is to discern and to diffuse the best that is known or thought in the world; and he shows how deeply French literature is indebted to the French Academy for the high general level it has attained in purity of style, taste, and restraint. He points out how we have failed in these respects for lack of such a court of appeal. But he goes on to observe that France, notwithstanding her Academy, never produced a Shakespeare or a Milton, who would, surely, have been condemned by such a tribunal. The critics, indeed, killed John Keats, just as the ecclesiastics burnt Joan of Arc.

Jerusalem is always liable to stone her prophets, if we allow her. Yet, notwithstanding such tragedies, it is not lost labour that responsible assemblies of Christian thinkers should offer guidance to their fellows on the most vital of all issues, that they should endeavour to discern and diffuse the best that is known or thought in the world of the mystery of Christ as they perceive it.

And, when all is said, Keats and Joan survive their executioners. No one asks to-day whether Savonarola or the Borgia Pope, Alexander VI, who burnt him, was the accredited minister of heaven. The most authoritative teacher must always be he who shall be seen to have interpreted the Absolute least inaccurately.

The Religion of Authority is the Religion of the Spirit.

ST. LUKE'S SECOND SOURCE

By the Rev. ERIC REDE BUCKLEY, M.A., Author of *An Introduction to the Synoptic Problem*.

THE view that St. Luke used a second continuous narrative of the life of Christ other than 'Mark' is not new, for it was set forth in detail, among others, by Dr. Vernon Bartlet in his Essay in the *Oxford Studies* (1911) and by myself in my *Introduction to the Synoptic Problem* (1912). On page 181 of that book I wrote St. Luke 'used his other source . . . as his groundwork and fitted into it so much of St. Mark as suited his purpose.' At the time this theory attracted little attention, but the advocacy of Dr. Streeter, who has worked it out admirably in his recent book on the Gospels and adduced further arguments in its favour, bids fair to win it more general acceptance. Roughly speaking, this second source may be regarded as having contained most of the non-Marcian matter found in *Luke* iii onwards, chapters i and ii being derived from yet another source. To this second source Dr. Streeter has given the convenient title of 'Proto-Luke': in it is contained a certain amount of matter derived from Q, but only those incidents and sayings to which 'Matthew' affords really close parallels are to be regarded as Q matter. The principal reasons in its favour may be briefly stated as follows:

1. It satisfactorily explains the large omissions of Marcan matter made by St. Luke, which are so hard to explain if 'Mark' is regarded as St. Luke's basic document.
2. It satisfactorily explains the doublets in 'Luke,' of which there are twelve; in eleven of these one branch of the doublet is found in a Marcan passage, the other in Proto-Luke, while the twelfth ('he that exalteth himself shall be abased,' etc.) is obviously the sort of brief saying which might have been spoken on more than one occasion.
3. It removes the difficulty with regard to the Q matter, which was inherent in the old 'two document hypothesis,' for it does not require us to assume either that St. Luke fitted sayings of Christ into contexts arbitrarily invented, or that St. Matthew arbitrarily grouped together sayings spoken on different occasions.

Accepting, then, the existence of Proto-Luke as a working hypothesis, we may proceed to give further arguments in support of it:

1. Where St. Luke omits 'Mark's' account of an incident and gives another, he usually gives it in a different context (*e.g.*, the call of Simon, *Luke* v, 1-11; the visit to Nazareth, *Luke* iv, 16-30; the anointing by a woman, *Luke* vii, 36-50). This desertion of 'Mark's' order, which St. Luke generally follows, seems to indicate that he is following the order of another written source, and not substituting scraps of oral tradition for 'Mark's' narratives.
2. In certain places where the bulk of the narrative is drawn from *Mark*, St. Luke inserts additions which, when read separately, appear to be complete but briefer accounts of the same event. Dr. Streeter notes one of these in *Luke* xix, 37-40 (the triumphal entry). A similar one occurs, in my opinion, in ix, 29-33 (the transfiguration), and perhaps in the non-Markan words in xix, 47, 'and he taught daily in the temple, but the chief of the people could not find what they might do'; others might be quoted from chapters xxii-xxiii, but these chapters present rather a more complicated problem than the earlier portion of the Gospel.
3. While the whole Gospel in its vocabulary bears the mark of one hand, and that the hand of the author or final reviser of *Acts*, there are just a few words and expressions which are specially characteristic of the Gospel but not of *Acts*; and we naturally ask whether these may not be characteristic of Proto-Luke.

It will help us if we begin by examining the way in which St. Luke revised the sections he drew from 'Mark': and we find that as a rule he did not reproduce Mark's characteristic expressions. Of the forty-one words and phrases characteristic of *Mark* (given by Sir John Hawkins in his *Horae Synopticae*) sixteen do not occur in *Acts*, and of these only six are found in *Luke*, and only once each; while those which do occur in *Acts* are found only rarely in *Luke*, with one exception, which will be considered later. We see, therefore, that there is nothing in the vocabulary of the Marcan sections of *Luke* which would have led us to suppose that St. Luke was not the author of them, if we did not possess *Mark*.

It is a very different matter when we apply the same kind of test to Proto-Luke. We find one word which occurs ten times in Proto-Luke, an expression which occurs five times and two others four times, none of which is found in *Acts*, and only the first, and that only once, in the Marcan sections of *Luke*. In addition to this, we find four or five expressions which do not occur in *Acts* and are far more common in Proto-Luke than in the Marcan sections. There is therefore a fairly strong case for supposing that these words and phrases are characteristics of Proto-Luke.

The one characteristically Marcan word (the imperfect of λέγω) which occurs also frequently in Proto-Luke presents a very intricate problem. In *Luke* and *Acts* the usual word to express 'he said' (they said) is the aorist (εἶπεν). It occurs about two hundred times in *Luke* and nearly one hundred in *Acts*. The imperfect of λέγω is found eleven times in *Acts*, but always with grammatical propriety, *i.e.*, where the sense requires an imperfect rather than an aorist.¹ In *Mark* and Proto-Luke this is not so; in both it is often used where an aorist would seem more appropriate. The strange thing, however, is that while in nineteen of the twenty-one passages in which St. Luke found it in *Mark* he substituted some other word for it, he used it (or let it stand) sixteen or eighteen times in Proto-Luke, though in every place an aorist would be more appropriate. Three times he uses it in a Marcan context when *Mark* does not use it, but in two of these places there is strong reason to believe that he is using Proto-Luke rather than *Mark*.

The conclusion I draw from these facts is that this inappropriate use of the imperfect of λέγω is a characteristic of Proto-Luke but not of St. Luke, since he does not employ it in *Acts* and usually expunges it from the Marcan sections of his Gospel.

If this conclusion be correct, it would seem to indicate that St. Luke was not himself the author of Proto-Luke, but that he attached a greater value to it than he did to *Mark* and corrected its peculiarities less thoroughly. I am even inclined to think that the true explanation of several expressions which occur frequently in *Luke*, and rarely or never in *Acts*, may be that St. Luke, in writing his Gospel, endeavoured to give it a certain

¹*Acts* xi, 16, is perhaps an exception: but here it introduces a saying of Christ, as it often does in the Gospel.

unity of style by employing some of the more characteristic phrases of Proto-Luke in the Marcan sections. This is all the more likely since several of the places in which they are found are editorial introductions to Marcan sections. It would not be strange if St. Luke's style when he wrote these was influenced by the style of his principal source.

The striking differences between the style of *Luke* and *Acts*, despite their many resemblances, have been observed long ago, and the explanation usually given by critics and commentators was that *Luke* was written many years before *Acts*, and that in the interval between the composition of the two books St. Luke's style changed somewhat. This explanation is in itself reasonable enough; and if, as Canon Streeter surmises, St. Luke himself was the author of Proto-Luke, it adequately explains the differences. If, however, as I incline to think, Proto-Luke was written by somebody else, it is no longer necessary to postulate a long interval between the composition of *Luke* and *Acts*, and the explanation, though not disproved, becomes unnecessary, and the arguments upon which it is based are seen to be unconvincing.

On the whole, the large number of words and phrases commonly found in *Acts* which are used in some of the Marcan section of *Luke* suggests, to my mind, that no very long interval elapsed between the composition of the two books, and this impression is strengthened by the absence from the Marcan sections of certain words and phrases used in Proto-Luke but not in *Acts*.

In chapters iii-xxi St. Luke for the most part keeps his Marcan and Proto-Luke matter distinct, giving a section first from the one and then from the other; but in chapters xxii-xxiii he shows a tendency to weld the two into one narrative, probably because at this point he found more matter common to both his sources than in the earlier part of Christ's life. Thus in chapter xxii, while verses 2-13 are derived from *Mark*, 14-38 are mainly from Proto-Luke, though verses 22, 33, 34 (and possibly 25, 26) are taken from *Mark*; if these Marcan verses are removed from *St. Luke*, a perfectly consistent and intelligible narrative remains.

In the same way we may reconstruct Proto-Luke's account of the Agony and the arrest of Jesus: 'And going out he went

according to custom to the *Mount of Olives*, but the disciples also followed him: and he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeling down he prayed; but an angel appeared to him from heaven strengthening him, and being in an agony he *prayed* more earnestly, and his sweat became as drops of blood falling down on the earth. And lo! a *multitude*, and he named *Judas* went before them and drew near to Jesus to *kiss* him, but Jesus said, Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss, And they about him seeing what was going to happen said, Lord, shall we smite with the sword? But Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far. And Jesus said to the *chief priests* and captains of the temple, and *elders*, who were come against him, This is your hour and the power of darkness. But when it became day the *Council* of the people was gathered together, and the whole multitude of them rising up led him away to *Pilate*.' (The words printed in italics indicate those to which *Mark* has a parallel.)

It will be noticed (i) that I have retained *Luke* xxii, 43, 44, despite their rejection by Westcott and Hort, because the early patristic evidence in their favour is very strong, including both Justin and Irenaeus; (ii) the words 'Suffer ye thus far' from their change of context receive a different, and I venture to think a more intelligible, meaning: they now appear as an injunction to the disciples not to meet violence with violence; (iii) that, if this reconstruction is correct, Proto-Luke contained no account of Christ's trial before the Sanhedrin or St. Peter's denials.

In a similar manner a brief and self-consistent account of the crucifixion can be pieced together from the non-Marcan portions of *Luke* xxiii; and if anyone will take the trouble, starting with the words 'and they led him away,' taken out of verse 26, to copy out vv. 27-33, 36, 37, 39-43, the latter part of v. 46 and 48, he will find that he has such an account.

The same cannot be done with the account of the burial of Christ and the women's visit to the tomb, and Dr. Streeter's opinion is no doubt right that Proto-Luke's account of them must have been so brief as to leave little or no trace in the narrative which is a mere recasting of *Mark*, though the two angels at the sepulchre and the statement that no man had ever yet lain in the tomb may be details taken from Proto-Luke.

It is of course probable that in the earlier as well as the later part of the Gospel *Mark* and Proto-Luke occasionally overlapped, and there is some reason to think that *Luke* v, 36 and 39, the list of the Apostles and the parable of the Sower (though not the explanation of it and the sayings which follow) may have stood in Proto-Luke.

1. *Luke* v, 36 and 39. The latter of these verses ('no one having drunk old wine desires new,' etc.) is peculiar to *Luke*, while the former, which contains the parable of the new cloth and the old garment, differs so considerably from the form of the saying found in *Mark* and *Matthew* as to suggest that *Luke's* version is, in part at any rate, independent of *Mark's*; moreover it is introduced by a kind of formula, 'but he spake also a parable to them that,' which appears to be a characteristic of Proto-Luke (*cf.* xii, 16; xiii, 6; xiv, 7; xv, 3; xvi, 1; xviii, 1 and 9). If we are right in taking these verses to have been part of Proto-Luke, we find that they are the next extract made from that source after v, 11, which records the call of Peter and the sons of Zebedee. The context is really quite appropriate, though of course an unfamiliar one to us who are accustomed to read and interpret them in their Marcan context.
2. The list of the Apostles. There are two reasons for regarding this as probably due to Proto-Luke: first, because the order of the matter taken from *Mark* is somewhat disarranged; secondly, because the name of Judas the son of James is substituted for that of Thaddaeus. On the other hand, there is a certain parallelism between *Mark* and *Luke* in the verses immediately preceding the list of the twelve. It should, however, be remembered that there is grave doubt about the genuineness of the words 'whom also he named apostles' in *Mark*; and if these words be removed from the Marcan account, *Luke* vi, 12, 13, may very well be independent of *Mark* iii, 13, 14, for practically the only two common features are the words 'into the mountain' and 'twelve.'
3. The parable of the Sower. Not only does the parable as given in *Luke* differ considerably in wording from *Mark's* version, but *Luke* omits *Mark's* introduction, which repre-

sents it as having been spoken by the seaside, and even seems to imply that it was spoken in a house (*cf. Luke* viii, 20).

4. To these perhaps we may add a considerable part of chapter xxi. It is instructive to read the following portions, none of which, except 10 and 11*a*, have any exact parallels in *Mark*, consecutively, for they will be found to give a good connected sense (10-12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21*b*, 22, 24, 25, 28, 34-36). It is true that 10 and 11*a* agree closely with *Mark* xiv, 8, but the opening words, 'then he said to them,' do not occur in *Mark*, and as they stand seem somewhat superfluous. It therefore seems a probable explanation that they stood at the head of the section in Proto-Luke which the evangelist was about to quote, and that this is a place in which *Mark* and Proto-Luke preserved the same saying in nearly the same words.

It should also be noticed that verse 21*b* follows far more appropriately after 20 than it does after 21*a*. In the words 'they that are in the midst of her' the 'her' obviously refers to Jerusalem, while as it stands in *Luke* it ought, grammatically, to refer to Judaea—a fairly conclusive proof that St. Luke is here weaving two sources together.

The reasons for thinking that these four passages may have been drawn from Proto-Luke are not perhaps absolutely conclusive, but they are sufficiently strong to deserve careful consideration, especially as it is antecedently probable that *Mark* and Proto-Luke would preserve a few at any rate of the same incidents and sayings.

I have long been of opinion that the episode of the woman taken in adultery (*John* vii, 53—viii, 11) came originally from Proto-Luke, and one group of cursives actually places it at the end of *Luke* xxi, where it fits in very appropriately. In spirit, style and vocabulary it is more akin to Proto-Luke than any other part of the New Testament, and it contains nine words and phrases which are more or less characteristic of Proto-Luke. If this theory is correct, it suggests that St. Luke did not embody the whole of Proto-Luke, and also gives us an idea of the way in which he revised that source when incorporating it in his Gospel.

A word must be said about chapters i and ii, which I agree with Dr. Streeter in thinking did not form part of Proto-Luke, but are derived from some other source. Like the rest of the Gospel, they bear clear traces of having been written or edited by the author of *Acts*: they also contain two expressions characteristic of *Luke* but not of *Acts* (viz., ἐγένετο followed by a finite verb and καὶ αὐτός when the pronoun is neither emphatic nor reflexive). The occurrence of these in chapters i and ii, as in the Marcan sections, may be explained either by postulating a considerable interval between the composition of *Luke* and *Acts*, or, since these expressions occur frequently in Proto-Luke, by assuming that St. Luke used them throughout his Gospel to give a certain unity of style to the whole.

There does not seem to be much evidence for determining the date of Proto-Luke. Unless it was by St. Luke himself, the linguistic argument is of no avail to prove that it was written any great length of time before it was incorporated in *Luke*, while the subject-matter affords no very convincing reasons for placing it at an early rather than a relatively later date. It seems to me less primitive than *Mark*, and chapter xxi suggests the possibility that it was not written till after the fall of Jerusalem. I am unable, however, to find any strong arguments either for or against an early date. The portrait it gives of our Lord is the most attractive and sympathetic of any contained in the Gospels, while some portions of His teaching preserved only in it—notably the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son—are among the most priceless jewels of Gospel tradition.

One would fain agree with Dr. Streeter in regarding it as no less primitive and authoritative than *Mark*, but when one wishes to reach a conclusion for which there is little positive evidence, one always fears that the wish may be father to the thought, and the critical conscience bids us suspend our judgment.

Whether Dr. Streeter is right or not in his views about the date and authorship of Proto-Luke, his statement of the case in favour of its existence is the best and clearest that has yet been made, and should be diligently studied by all who take an interest in the origin of the Synoptic Gospels.

MUSIC IN WORSHIP¹

By the Rev. LESLIE S. HUNTER, M.A., Canon of Newcastle.

IN recent years the Archbishops have appointed committees to consider several important subjects, and to publish their conclusions for the guidance of the Church. One of the most valuable of these reports is that on Church Music,² which was published at the end of 1923, and signed by some of the ablest musicians in the service of the Church. Unfortunately, it has not yet had the attention it deserves. The great merit of the Report is that it sets out to help the churches that most need help—namely, the great majority whose musical resources are slender. It recognizes that there is not one standard for all churches, but at least three, so that suggestions appropriate to a cathedral are not always appropriate to a village church; and it sets before churches with small resources an ideal which they can realize.

The cause, perhaps, of some of the worst failures in Church music has been the prevalence of a single standard and ideal, and that the cathedral. During the last century, the cathedral dignitaries and organists who guided the musical taste of the Church did little except exalt the cathedral style as it then was. When diocesan choirs went up to their cathedral for festival, they were regaled with a very full-blown cathedral service; and it was implied, if not said, that this was the ideal at which *all* churches ought to aim. Alas, only too many have so aimed, and still do.

In fairness, however, to cathedral music to-day, it must be said that the cathedral standard to-day is, happily, not what it was in the dark Victorian days. In the last half century artistic education has greatly improved. There has been a rediscovery and revival of the art of the people—folk-music and folk-dancing. Men have found out again that the simple is nearly always beautiful, and the elaborate very rarely is. Even in

¹ An address at an Afternoon of Music, followed by a simple Evensong, in Newcastle Cathedral, to which the organist and some members of the choir from every parish in the diocese were invited.

² *Music in Worship* (S.P.C.K., paper 1/-). Every Church Council should buy two copies, and present one to the vicar and the other to the organist.

cathedrals we are beginning to see that there may be more truth and beauty in a simple folk-tune than in Barnby's *Te Deum* in treble X. Consequently, the Cathedral tradition has become simpler. If you want to hear the Ely confession and artificial and inappropriate flowers of that kind, you must not come here.

The principles which underlie good art and craftsmanship are few. There are in the main four which should govern the selection and performance of music in worship.

1. *'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God; Him only shalt thou serve.'*

It is of first importance that Church music should be worthy of God who is the source of truth and beauty, and be acceptable and pleasing to Him. It is not of first importance that it should be acceptable to Mr. Snooks, even if Mr. Snooks should be the leading tenor, or the chief sidesman. It requires a great deal of optimism, or something worse, to believe that all the music sung in churches on Sundays gives pleasure up in heaven. Music in worship is an offering, not to man, but to God. Therefore nothing less than the best will do.

What is the best, someone asks. A complete answer to the question would be lengthy;³ and therefore only three suggestions towards an answer can be made in a short address:

(a) It is not just a matter of opinion. The amount of opinionativeness that there is in things musical is amazing. It varies in inverse ratio with musical knowledge. Those who would not listen to anyone who began '—Shakespeare, a very inferior artist, now Marie Corelli . . .' frequently do listen to musical opinions of that calibre. There *is* a standard of 'good' in music as there is in other arts. If a hundred tunes were submitted to the members of the Committee which drew up the report on 'Music in Worship,' there would probably be agreement in regard to the worth of ninety of them.

(b) 'The best' in Church music is a matter of fitness. We ought to offer God in worship music which corresponds to His character. If He is thought to be a kindly, indulgent, sentimental Being, then sensuous and sentimental tunes will be appropriate. If on the other hand men believe that God is like Christ, they ought to sing music which is strong and manly and beautiful.

³ Cf. some admirable pages in the Report, pp. 7—12.

But in practice, taking *Hymns Ancient and Modern* as the norm, while we believe that God is like the 'Strong Son of God,' we offer Him music which is anything but strong. Hymn-tunes which stir sentiment and moisten eyes are popular, partly because they are first-cousins to the drawing-room and music-hall love ditty, and partly because when sung together by large congregations at evensong they provide what seems to be a short cut to mystical experience—in the same kind of way that the service of Benediction in the Roman Church does. The danger of both is that they satisfy; and consequently people do not continue to seek for the real thing.

Not only does such music produce the wrong kind of subjective emotion, but, as I have said, it leads in time to a wrong idea of God. Stained-glass windows and nineteenth century tunes have done much to produce a Christ myth unrelated to the Jesus of history.

A simple test of the fitness of music in Christian worship is to find out whether it is the kind of music that stirs and strengthens the finer and healthier emotions—whether irrespective of the words to which it is set, the singing of it makes us stronger and better men. Such music may not be so popular in its first appeal, but in time its appeal will be just as strong and much more healthy. If I could illustrate this point, I would contrast the two tunes sung to 'Jesu, Lover of my Soul'—Hollingside and Aberystwyth—the latter a tune which does express the vigour and grace of Christ's personality in a way that the former tune does not. Similarly one might compare Vaughan Williams' tune to 'For all the Saints,' with its splendid suggestion of the Church militant and triumphant, and yet not untouched by tenderness, with Barnby's tune.⁴

(c) 'The best' is a matter of the way services are sung. And this leads into the three other principles which should govern the selection and performance of music in worship.

2. *It is better to do a little well than a lot—not very well.*

This is an axiom of all good workmanship. There is more of truth and beauty in a single phrase sung perfectly than in long anthems sung imperfectly. If choirs that compete in

⁴I have developed this point more fully in an address on 'Orlando Gibbons and English Church Music,' which appeared in the July issue of the *S. Martin's Review*.

Musical Tournaments—it is a pity that so few church choirs do—are often better than church choirs, it is because they learn from the experience that the way they sing matters more than the amount—quality rather than quantity. Church choirs are too easily satisfied. If some of the attention given to anthems were given to the singing of the responses it would help congregations to worship. More people would come to church, and coming would get more benefit, if choirs and organists—and *the clergy*—had a higher standard of workmanship.

3. *Take care of the silence, and the sounds will take care of themselves.*

That is at least as true as the original proverb. Slovenly singing is the singing which does not give notes their true value, and is always prolonging the sounds into the intervals of silence. The intervals of silence are as integral to the structure of a musical composition, and to its effect, as space in architecture, or shadows in a landscape. What is true of a piece of music is true of a Liturgy. The climax of worship in the Sanctus, and again in the people's Amen, to the Prayer of Consecration must be followed by silence if words and ritual are to have proper value. In these noisy hurrying days we need to guard the silences of worship.⁵ It is in them that God, so to say, makes His response. If the clergy, the organist and the choir fill up all the silences with their sounds, people will go away with their heart's desires unfilled—they do. There is often too much music in our services. Even the precious silence during the Administration of the Sacrament is often broken by hymns or vapid extemporizations on the organ.

'Take care of the silence' ought to be a principle which any choir could keep, and yet, like singing pianissimo, it is only the best-trained choirs which seem able to keep it.

4. *'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'*

Sir Walford Davies once quoted that to a young curate who went to him about voice production. For those who conduct services and sing them, their neighbour for the time being is the congregation. If they believe in what they are saying or

⁵ It would add to reality in hymns if congregations, instead of struggling to their feet while the choir is singing the first line, were to stand in silence for a quarter of a minute before a hymn began. Similarly, at the opening of a Service a space of silence is needed.

singing, they will wish the congregation to hear easily, and they will try to make sounds which will help the congregation to worship. For example, intoning is not in ordinary-sized churches such a sound, although in large and resonant buildings it may be a necessity. Except in the parts of the service which are choral, it is inartistic and unworshipful, and has been the ruin of many clerical voices. To intone—loudly—the penitential openings of Mattins and Evensong, and to sing the Confession, does not make penitence real. They should be said in a quiet and natural voice; so, also, the intercessory prayers after the Third Collect and the Amens to them.

For choirs, as well as for officiating priests, their neighbour is the congregation. A Christian choir will love its neighbour at least as much as it is in love with itself. Choirs were brought into existence to help congregations to worship and to sing. That is the primary job of a choir—even of a cathedral choir. ‘Let the *People* praise Thee’ ought to be written over the top of all song-schools.

The reason why choirs do not make congregations sing are three:

- (1) Sometimes they do not want to. They steal for themselves the people’s part of the Service—which is sin.
- (2) They are in the wrong position. If a choir is couped up in a narrow medieval chancel, as choirs have been since the Oxford Movement, they cannot make a congregation sing. To lead congregational singing, choir and organ should be behind the congregation.
- (3) The setting of the popular parts of the service—hymns, psalms and canticles—is often too high. Congregational singing must for the most part be unison singing.

The section of the Report on ‘*Music in Worship*’ which concerns churches with limited musical resources is largely a plea for unison singing, and is in praise of the beauty and power of good unison singing.*

* Its signatories do not like to say so bluntly, but their advice to village churches is, in effect, get rid of A. & M. and the *Cathedral Psalter*, in which the settings are usually high.

One of the hindrances to congregational singing undoubtedly is the large amount of chanting in the services. Anglican chants are difficult to sing. Few choirs give enough time to their practice to sing them well; congregations do not sing them at all (canticles excepted). There are two solutions.⁷ One is for a church to work on a small number of unison chants, and for the vicar or organist to teach them to the congregation at congregational practices. The strong congregational singing in S. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, has been built upon congregational practices and unison singing, with the help of a voluntary choir which does not sit in the choir-stalls.

The other solution is to *say* the Psalms (*and* the Glorias). But a congregation should be trained in the saying of the psalms as carefully as in the singing. Usually, of course, when psalms are said, it is like a game of musical chairs—everyone in a scramble not to be the last. There are, however, few things more moving than a large body of people reciting together if it is done with flexibility, and with attention to the meaning and rhythm of the words. It would make the psalms more real and enjoyable than they usually are to members of the congregation. Corporate recitation is an art form which is again coming into vogue. It is one which our churches, especially village churches, might make their own.

Another recommendation of the Report is that some churches might get along better without a choir. There are few sounds more depressing than an unbalanced choir, or a choir of only three parts, trying to sing four-part music. Where a balanced choir is not possible, the Report suggests that vicar and organist should concentrate on congregational singing. It might also be possible to have a quartett or a double quartett of voices. The quartett would not sing elaborate settings to those parts of the service which the people ought to sing, but

⁷ Further suggestions are that congregations might be made familiar with simple 'settings' to the Te Deum and Magnificat in the same way as is done with Merbecke's Creed and Gloria in excelsis; that the Revised Psalter be used, which reduces the quantity of Psalms on Sundays; that those who are revising the Prayer Book might make the Venite optional, and allow a hymn as alternative to the second canticle in Mattins and Evensong. Dr. Frere has somewhere, I think, advocated metrical psalms, as in the Church of Ireland and the Scottish Presbyterian churches.

would provide *supplementary* music—introits, and occasional anthems and, more occasionally, descants and faux-bourbons to hymn-tunes. It would be better, even in 'quires and places where they sing,' if choirs spent themselves upon supplementary music rather than on elaborate settings of the canticles, many of which are a burden to flesh and spirit of them that listen.

There is no beautiful thing more needed in public life to-day than good workmanship in the conduct and expression of public worship. It is often said in defence of non-church-going that many services are 'unreal.' If the criticism means anything it means that they are wanting in the sense of God; and it is a summons to those who are responsible for the ordering and leading of Public Worship, to do their part as well as it can be done. If they make it a true and lovely act of service to God and their neighbour, it will more than many exhortations help to restore the worshipful spirit and habit in country and town.

BOOK REVIEWS

A SIMPLE INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

Mr. Neill tells us that in writing this book he had in view the needs of boys, never having found exactly the book about the New Testament which he wished to put into their hands. The boys in question are presumably those of sixth form standard at least, since the book is based upon work done by the writer in preparation for the Theological Tripos, and indeed smacks of the lecture-room on almost every page.

It is a volume which will be found helpful by many. Mr. Neill has an adequate grasp of critical problems as well as a most thorough knowledge of the text of the New Testament. By temperament he is conservative, and there are traces of a homiletic tendency where homiletics are out of place, and of a certain dogmatism in the interests of orthodoxy, the mark perhaps of one whose undergraduate days are not far distant.

As an example of the writer's bias towards edification, we quote the following: 'We may suppose, besides the inspiration of the New Testament, a special work of the Holy Spirit, securing that none of the essential books should be lost and that the Church should be rightly guided in various decisions as to which books should, and which should not, be accepted as Holy Scripture.' This 'special work of the Holy Spirit' is later adduced as a guarantee of the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, but what is its precise bearing on the genuineness of 2 Peter we are not sure.

Mr. Neill's dogmatism may be illustrated by his cavalier dismissal of the 'Little Apocalypse' theory of Mark xiii. 'It is often maintained,' he tells us, 'with no good foundation that large parts of this passage are a Jewish Apocalypse of the date of the destruction of the Temple, which simply means that the critics do not like the passage and wish to be rid of

**How Readest Thou?* By Stephen Neill. (S.C.M., 1925. 4/- and 2/6.)

it.' The theory, no doubt, may be right or wrong, but the attribution of such unworthy motives to scholars of the calibre of Dr. Charles is a mark of immaturity which we cannot but note with regret.

Nor are Mr. Neill's own theories always such as to demand confidence. For example, he accepts as historical the recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus by the demons, ranking them apparently with the centurion at the cross as among the 'spiritually discerning'! Again, we are told that the mother of Jesus is kept strictly in the background, 'as though to emphasise the truth that she has no share in the redeeming work of her son.' Surely an anachronism of a rather startling kind! Once more we are asked to accept the Johannine chronology for the last week of our Lord's life, and to argue therefrom that Jesus must have died on a Thursday and have lain three days in the grave, a theory said to find support in the prediction attributed to him in *Matthew* xii, 40, that 'as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.' The evidence for this passage being not our Lord's utterance, but an early Christian gloss, is very strong. Surely, too, it is a mistake to claim that, with the exception of *John* xxi, 'the appearances of Jesus all take place in or near Jerusalem.' Why must *Matthew* xxviii, 16, be thus ruthlessly eliminated? Finally, Mr. Neill, in common with so many defenders of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, invites our acceptance of the contention that the difference of audience would largely account for the change of style and subject-matter in the Johannine discourses. How often must these champions of tradition be reminded that the great discourse on the Bread of Life is represented as having been delivered to a Galilean crowd? And why should the disciples, when staying in Jerusalem, be held capable of assimilating the teaching of *John* xiii to xvii, whereas in Galilee such teaching would appear to have been beyond their grasp?

But while there is much in this book to criticize, there is much also which we may cordially commend. The different aims and characteristics of the four Evangelists are well brought out. And the exposition of many of the Epistles, more particularly *Romans*, which we may suppose Mr. Neill to have studied with special care when working for the Tripos, is clear, concise and frequently illuminating.

The task which our author set himself was an ambitious one, and if we are sometimes disposed to cavil at his statements, and to resent a certain measure of over-confidence in the presentation of his position, he has for all that achieved a not inconsiderable success. To find fault with a writer on the score of youth is a sure sign of advancing years in his critic. Yet we cannot help wishing that Mr. Neill had waited five or ten years before writing his book. He has knowledge and zeal in abundance; but when dealing with so great a subject as the whole field of the New Testament, knowledge and zeal alone are an equipment scarcely adequate for the task. We miss on occasions that balance of judgment, that maturity of thought, that ready sympathy with other points of view, which compensate, in part at least, for the freshness and impetuosity of ardent youth.

W. MAURICE PRYKE.

A PURITAN SAINT.*

Mr. Lloyd Thomas has done us a good service in giving us this handy edition of Baxter's Autobiography. A good introductory essay, in which he analyses the feelings of Baxter in regard to the main problems of the day, should help the general reader to understand the manifold interests

**The Autobiography of Richard Baxter* (abridged) with Introduction, Appendices and Notes by J. M. Lloyd Thomas. (J. M. Dent and Sons. Price 7/6.)

shown in the *Autobiography*. Perhaps the writer is a little misleading when he suggests that Baxter was 'never a Presbyterian'. He died, as he lived, a moderate Episcopalian' (p. xxvii). Technically this is true, but Baxter would have added that a 'moderate Episcopalian' was the only true Presbyterian. Though he could criticise the faults of the Presbyterians, he was yet the staunch defender of their cause, and occasionally this blinded him to the merits of other systems. It was his sympathy with the Presbyterian ideal which led him to criticise the diocesan frame of the Episcopate and to refuse a bishopric himself—chiefly because this 'species of episcopacy' placed a too extensive power in the hands of the bishop.

The *Autobiography*, though it affords much of real value to the student of history, has a special value for the theologian. It gives an admirable picture of Puritan life from within and enables one to trace the effects on this of the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and the intrigues of the Restoration period. Born into a family which set a high value on the Bible and yet brought up in a parish where religion had degenerated into convention, Baxter became as zealous for Christianity as he was ardent for its reformation. He gives us a few sorrowful glimpses into the parish life of his time: in one place there had been 'four readers successively in six years' time, ignorant men and two of them immoral' (p. 3); within a small area were 'a dozen more ministers near eighty years apiece . . . ignorant and most of scandalous lives' (p. 4). Elsewhere was a vicar 'unlearned and sometimes drunk,' and his curate 'a railing quarreller' and an 'ignorant and insufficient man' (p. 23). All this helps to explain the Puritan zeal for preaching; convinced of their mission and eager to prosecute it, they were ready to suffer any injury or insult if they could preach the 'pure Word of God'; and for a century or more it was the Puritan and not the Anglican who insisted on a 'preaching ministry.'

Baxter felt keenly his lack of academic training, but his private studies were fairly wide. His life-story helps us to trace the growth of the demand for toleration, and in view of his own broad-minded attitude it is interesting to note that a Jesuit, some zealous Puritans, and at least one of the Cambridge Platonists (Culverwell) influenced his early reading. The self-sacrificing efforts which he made to become more widely read—'I take not any piece of true learning to be useless,' he said—should make us more careful in dismissing Puritan zeal as ignorant fanaticism. His own warnings (pp. 10f, 217, etc.) on the danger of the appeal to the emotional element in religion are still necessary to-day.

Baxter was never popular. For one thing he was too outspoken; he exposed mere lip-service when speaking with Protector or Archbishop as much as he condemned drunkenness in his 'rude and revelling people.' Again, he could see too far, and in upholding the principles of religion against non-essentials he often failed to carry others with him. He was superstitious, and this and his semi-asceticism appear strange to the modern mind. But the *Autobiography* tells of a real religious experience; and for those who would know wherein lay both the strength and the weakness of Puritanism this is an indispensable book.

J.P.H.

THE REAL MARTIN LUTHER.*

Of late years there has been such a wealth of literature published on subjects akin to the Reformation that one is inclined to question the need for another book on Luther. But Prof. Mackinnon's study of Luther's life and works has a special value and it merits consideration, first, because it

**Luther and the Reformation*. Vol. I: Early life and religious development to 1517
By James Mackinnon, D.D. (Longmans. Price 16/-.)

deals with much new material, and, secondly, because it is an attempt to interpret Luther's writings in the light of the various influences which from time to time affected his outlook. Despite the stimulus which the discovery of many of Luther's long-lost works gave to the study of his life, there has been, for the English reader at least, no really good book on Luther which could give in an unbiassed way the meaning and significance of his life. Much has been written on Luther, but several causes, including the influence of the extreme views of some Continental writers, have led to a depreciation of his work and a failure to understand his life story.

Prof. Mackinnon believes that 'sympathy is a surer guide to truth than hatred'; hence, while he recognizes both the strength and the weakness of Luther's character he yet exposes the theory—now so prevalent—that the mistakes of Luther were such as to invalidate his work. The picture of Luther, which Denifle and his school have drawn, has had a wide and pernicious influence; and while Denifle's research has undoubtedly brought to the fore much that had escaped the eyes of Protestant writers, yet we agree with Prof. Mackinnon's estimate of Denifle's work as a whole as 'grossly prejudiced and certainly not an unbiassed interpretation of the evidence' (p. 95). For example, the author examines the evidence which Denifle used to support his characterization of Luther as immoral and given to sexual desires, and he disposes of this as based on no sufficient evidence other than a wrong interpretation of the meaning which Luther attached to the word 'concupiscence.' Occasionally the Professor is a little unjust to Denifle: in our opinion, for example, his arguments for the freshness of Luther's interpretation of *Romans* i, 12, do not meet those of his opponent which he is attempting to refute.

We agree with the writer both in his regard for Luther as the inspiring personality and pivot of the religious Reformation and in his estimate of the reformer's importance for the modern world. His deep hatred of sin, his vivid experience of the communion of the soul with God, his rejection of formalism, and his stand against superstition, all encouraged a deeper reality in religion. But whatever view of his life is taken, this volume, which concerns itself with Luther's early years, is of great value both for the light which it throws on the various influences which helped to fashion Luther's views, and for the helpful and careful discussion of the gradual development of his beliefs. In early years a thorough-going Papalist, he still condemned heresy even when he had plainly departed from the customary teaching of the Church. In common with Tertullian, he believed that 'whatsoever savours not of truth is heresy even though it be ancient custom' (*de Virg. Vel.* i). The stages in the development of his ideas even in this early period are fairly well marked, and Prof. Mackinnon attempts to show what authors influenced him at each stage and how his mind reacted against some of the characteristic medieval ideas. Like Burke, Luther was never restrained by a false idea of consistency. He constantly found difficulties which he had not foreseen, and he faced up to them with that courage which is necessary for one who is cutting new paths. Benjamin Whichcote taught us that 'He who never changed any of his opinions never corrected any of his mistakes.'

Occasionally, Prof. Mackinnon drops into a difficult style by his use of curious constructions and complicated sentences. What, for example, is the meaning of 'God, Christ is the perfectly righteous judge, before whom the sinner must give account'; or again, 'Grace, salvation may not be merited by his own works . . .' (p. 117)? This construction appears several times in the pages of the book. A sentence on p. 117 will cause some trouble until it is realized that a word has dropped out.

J.P.H.

A PASTURE FOR LAMBS.

We welcomed the publication of Dr. Dearmer's first four volumes of *Lessons on the Way*. They appeared to us to be the best manuals for teaching to young people the Christian Religion as understood by a modern Churchman which we have as yet come across. They were simple, sincere, thoughtful, well-informed, courageous, but above all they were interesting. That does not mean that we should agree with every statement made. It would be absurd to expect that. The fifth volume,* which has just been published, is equal, if not superior, to its predecessors. In our view it is superior, *vires crescit eundo*. It deals with the Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments. We should like to cite examples of Dr. Dearmer's teaching. Here is one dealing with Divine Forgiveness. Dr. Dearmer emphasizes that the supreme condition for receiving the Divine Forgiveness is that we should forgive others. He adds :—

'There is no other condition. When people say "You must trust in the atoning blood of Jesus if you wish to be forgiven," they are teaching something which Jesus never taught. When other people say "You must go to Confession before a priest if you wish to be forgiven," they are teaching something which Jesus never taught' (p. 68). Here is another citation, headed 'A Lovely Word':—

'We just have to remember this special meaning of Grace. Words often have more than one meaning. And this word means something quite different when you ask someone to say Grace before dinner or when you say "She dances with much grace," or "He has a very gracious manner," or "The Three Graces." The word is a very interesting one: in Latin (*gratia*), from which we get it, it means favour or friendship, and also charm or beauty, and also gratitude, which shows how men connected all these things in their mind. You get this still more clearly in Greek, when the word meant at first just beauty and *charm*; then it meant a *favour*, a charming thing done, and so it came to mean the *kindness* in the person who did it, and then the *gratitude* in the person who received it, and the general delight which it caused. So in the New Testament all these lovely ideas of the Greek word *charis* were used to describe the help that God gives' (p. 3).

This is worthy of Archbishop Trench.

We have but space to give one more citation. It also is a philological one and deals with the word Mass:

'It has no particular meaning, it is just a short, popular name; indeed we do not know for certain what it comes from, though it is supposed to be a corruption of the Latin *missio*, "sending," or of the concluding words of the Latin service, "*Ite, missa est*," "go, it is sent"; but all this is uncertain. . . . It is found as early as the fourth century. . . . As it has no definite meaning and does not describe any particular aspect of the service, and as it is a handy, popular word, it is rather a good name' (pp. 146-147).

We should have thought these were rather strong reasons against the re-introduction of the term Mass into the language of the English Church, more especially as it had been deliberately rejected at the Reformation as it was associated with a doctrine of the Eucharist which the Church of England has explicitly condemned. It is, however, a sub-title of the Communion in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

**Lessons on the Way*, Vol. V: '*The Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments*.' By Percy Dearmer, D.D. (Heffers, Cambridge. Price 4/- net.)

The number of first-rate stories, told in a first-rate way, which this volume contains adds to its value. We hope all Sunday School teachers and even parish priests will purchase these excellent manuals. If they do not, they need not complain that they do not know where to get modern, helpful religious teaching for the young people in their charge.

THE SCHOLASTICS AND MODERNISM.*

The contents of this book are somewhat different from what the title might lead us to expect. Ignorance, faith and conformity are indeed the main themes of its pages, but the treatment differs from that of corresponding subjects in recent books with similar titles. Nearly all the discussions are historical, centering round the Scholastics, and it is only in the last chapter that these Mediaeval wranglings are brought into relationship with burning problems in the Church of England at the present time.

Mr. Kirk is primarily concerned with the history of the term 'invincible ignorance' from the time of Abailard (who appears to have first used the phrase) downwards. What ought the Church's attitude to be towards those who, after due consideration, were unable to accept her formulated doctrines? Still more important, what was God's attitude to such recalcitrants? Were they morally guilty? And if they were not morally guilty, would God allow them to suffer eternal torments in the next world? And what of God's attitude to those who had never even heard of the Christian faith? These were pressing problems throughout the Middle Ages, but especially after the discovery of America, when the Church came into touch with masses of people of whose very existence she had hitherto been unaware. Abailard held the not very comforting doctrine that, though the heathen were not morally guilty, there was nothing in store for them in the next world except eternal damnation. Gradually a laxer view forced its way to acceptance; and Mr. Kirk traces the history down to 1863, when Pius IX could write: 'God, who sees and knows the mind, the soul, the heart, the dispositions of every man, would scarcely in His mercy allow anyone to suffer eternal torment unless he were guilty of voluntary sin' (quoted p. 62).

Perhaps the discussion in Chapter IV is the most interesting. Here Aquinas' attitude towards these questions is summarised. The author begins with a singularly clear exposition of Thomas' doctrine of Faith, showing how deeply his ideas on this subject are coloured by Aristotle; then he points out that for Aquinas the praiseworthiness (or 'merit') of faith depended upon its 'voluntariness,' and proceeds to show what difficulties this conception landed him in when he came to treat of those who, through no apparent wantonness, were unable to accept the Christian faith. The growth of the belief in the inculpability of 'invincible ignorance' in later Mediaeval times was, as Mr. Kirk points out, only possible through the (sometimes unconscious) abandonment of the Thomistic doctrine of faith, even by its formulator's own disciples. But for Aquinas 'to admit the plea of "invincible ignorance" in anything more than the extreme minority of men is to deny either the reasonableness of faith (and consequently its praiseworthiness as well) or the inherent Godward tendency in man. And neither of these alternatives could be accepted by the author of the *Summa Theologica* and the *Summa contra Gentiles*' (pp. 122f.).

The last chapter attempts to state the attitude of the Church of England to such problems. The author maintains that the part played by Law in the Roman communion is played by Custom in our case. We have

**Ignorance, Faith, and Conformity. Studies in Moral Theology.* By K. E. Kirk. (Longmans, Green, and Co., 1925. Pp. viii+167. Price 8/6.)

nothing corresponding to the Roman Codex of Canon Law. As it is, of course, well known, the Englishman seems to have a rooted objection to any codification of his laws, civil as well as ecclesiastical. But custom cannot be binding under penalty in the same way that law can. Hence there is possible in our communion that wide divergence of belief and practice which its friends (including ourselves) call our 'inclusiveness,' and its enemies our 'chaos' and 'indiscipline' (p. 150). F.L.C.

A GUIDE TO MODERN BIBLICAL LITERATURE.*

It would be a melancholy, though fortunately impossible, task to estimate the amount of time wasted in the study of books of little or no value. In no sphere is there so much matter published as in the sphere of religion; and this is still true notwithstanding the decline in the numbers of those who take part in religious observances, a decline which a certain type of literature emphasizes almost to weariness. But in no field is the standard of books bounded by such extreme limits as that of religion. Religious literature ranges from works of a standard of excellence probably not surpassed anywhere (*e.g.*, those of Hort and Lightfoot) to books and pamphlets from which it is quite impossible to deduce any coherent thoughts or ideas whatsoever, and in which it is often difficult to suppose that the author himself can have had any such.

The book before us has been compiled by a Committee of the Society for Old Testament Study to meet this situation. It is a Scripture bibliography intended in the first place for those engaged in school teaching. We fear that the list of books recommended for study both to the teachers and to their classes presupposes a standard of perfection which is far beyond that of most secondary schools. But perhaps the complete list is regarded primarily as an ideal. We would, however, suggest that in a second edition the really essential works should be asterisked.

The theological student, on the other hand, will find this long list a help rather than a hindrance. It can be heartily recommended to him. He will miss occasionally works with which he ought to be familiar, *e.g.*, Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint*, and the Greek grammars of Winer and Blass. The omission of H. L. Jackson's *The Fourth Gospel* also surprises us. But the list of treatises selected is thoroughly representative in spite of such occasional omissions. F.L.C.

CORRESPONDENCE

A MODERNIST COUNTRY PARSON.

We publish with exceptional pleasure the following letter from the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

I see that you refer in the Conference Number of the *Modern Churchman* to the Rev. J. E. Kelsall, Rector of Milton, as an example of the good work done by Modernists in country parishes. I do not think that you could possibly have given a better example. A great friend of mine was for some years his curate, and I have had of late a holiday bungalow in his parish. Perhaps your readers may like to know a little more about him.

*A *Scripture Bibliography*. For the use of teachers in Secondary Schools and Bible Students. (Nisbet and Co., London (1925). Pp. 40. Price 6d.)

I do not think that I have ever known a country clergyman more universally liked and respected. People of all classes have spoken to me of him in exactly the same way. His unique characteristic was this: Not only had he an extraordinarily wide range of interests, but, instead of these things taking him away from his duties as a parish priest, he turned them all to account. He was a musician, and he used music in his services with admirable judgment. He was a botanist, and he taught his parishioners botany. He was a French scholar, and he taught French and took parties of his parishioners over to France, I think, more than once to practise their French. He seemed to me all the better a parish priest because he was an educator as well. He had bad health, and, when I knew him, was often, I fear, in pain; and yet he seemed to get hold of the boys and young men far more than many who can join in their games. He was, of course, a Modernist; but what you say about his preaching is true to my experience of him. There was no party-spirit in him. Indeed once, when I ventured to suggest that he had not stated the evidence correctly on a point with which he had dealt, he asked me to state the other side in his parish magazine. He was very free in his use of the Prayer Book. I don't think that I have ever been present at a service in his church which was strictly in accordance with 'our incomparable liturgy.' But his taste and judgment were so excellent that his alterations invariably seemed improvements; and, if they had not been, his personal charm would have carried them through. Our too early loss of him is deplorable.

H. L. GOUDGE.

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

MODERNISM AND ORTHODOXY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

I am in hopes that, by throwing open your columns to those fellow Christians who look at life from a different angle, you are facilitating a better understanding between two sections of the Church of Christ in this country. You have also given us a good example of courteous and temperate statement and of lucidity of language. While recognizing the crudeness of classification shown by party names, we can only do good if we patiently disentangle the fundamental points of divergence.

For the issue is very grave. Let me quote from a letter lately received from India.

'I was lent a paper called *The Moslem Outlook Review* to-day. Great excitement at Bishop Barnes' pronouncements on his description of ritual as 'Mystery Worship.' I had a long talk with an educated Mohammedan, who lent me the paper. He declares that such persons as Bishop Barnes, Dr. Rashdall and others have disposed of the doctrine of Christ's Divinity. I should say the position of Missions was becoming intolerable. . . . The worst of it is the Church of England as a body takes no notice. The Mohammedans say 'Very little will separate us—and we are drawing closer every year.'

Now doubtless many of your readers would repudiate the inference here drawn. They would say 'Truth is Truth, and her claims are paramount: consequences are negligible.' So let us go deeper and ask what is at stake. Is our Moslem critic quite wrong in supposing that the central doctrine of Christianity is in jeopardy?

Broadly speaking, the fundamental difference is between two types of mind. The orthodox I take to be those who readily accept certain statements giving the early Christian interpretation of Christ's work. Their

plea is that though they cannot comprehend the statements they can live by them and find joy in passing them on to others. (I omit the orthodox whose profession of belief is lifeless and indolent, and whose minds are closed against new ideas.) The Modernist I take to be one who is unwilling to accept interpretations of Christ which transcend his mental faculties and experience, or which seem to violate principles of justice, or to imply fitful and arbitrary interventions by God interrupting the uniformity of Nature. (I omit the 'extremists' who can only accept the doctrine of the Incarnation in a most attenuated form. There are many in the class described who stoutly profess themselves to be doctrinal Christians.) Thus their inclination is to simplify the Christian Creed by excision or modification of clauses which speak of mysteries; *i.e.* such contact of the Divine or the human as results in an event which, besides being abnormal, is not comprehensible, and seems to them unnecessary. Hence Modernists either deny or remain doubtful about such dogmas as Christ's bodily resurrection, all mystery in the Atonement, Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and the Virgin Birth.

Now my object is to promote a better understanding between the two groups by stating first what appears to 'orthodox' Churchmen to be the principle of interpretation of Christianity which would be acknowledged by the 'Centre' of the Modernist party. This I have tried to do. Before proceeding further I hope you, Sir, would be good enough to say if my description is fair, and to correct me where it is not.

One rejoinder I will anticipate. It may be said in general terms that the scientific discoveries of the last eighty years have changed the whole complexion of the subject. There are some questions, I admit, which have been affected, but not, as far as I can see, the particular and very grave ones which I have enumerated. Possibly some cogent arguments may be brought against this contention; but till they are, I am inclined to hold to the diagnosis I have suggested.

E. LYTTELTON.

February 1, 1926.

[We are glad to publish Dr. Lyttelton's letter. In 'Signs of the Times' in this number we treat briefly some aspects of the issue which his letter raises as they are presented in an editorial in the *Church Times* of January 29th.

For the statement in his letter that 'the Modernist . . . is unwilling to accept interpretations of Christ which transcend his mental faculties and experience,' we should prefer to substitute that *the Modernist is unable to accept interpretations of the Person of Christ which conflict with the results of historical criticism*. Of course the Modernist cannot profess to believe that God can or does act in a way which is irrational or immoral, although he is ready to admit that the Divine action, as he now experiences it, is not in all respects capable of being shown to be rational and moral, yet nevertheless it is the Modernist's conviction that the Divine action is essentially rational and moral.

With regard to the other points raised, *e.g.* the Atonement, Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, we require definition of terms before we can decide how we stand to Dr. Lyttelton.

(1) Will he say succinctly what he means by them? The Virgin Birth and Christ's bodily resurrection are primarily historical problems, and if they are denied by Modernists, they are denied primarily on historical grounds. (2) If the weight of historical evidence be against these dogmas, would Dr. Lyttelton urge that they ought to be accepted? Would Dr. Lyttelton kindly answer a third question. (3) What does he mean by 'mysteries'? If by

mysteries he means matters which transcend reason (our rational and moral consciousness), what does he put forward as the ground for a rational and moral being accepting them?

There is one other point. We should prefer Dr. Lyttelton to use, in contrast to Modernist, the term Traditionalist, not orthodox. The present writer would feel a real difficulty in affirming that a number of Traditionalists are orthodox, when he knows them to be Tritheists, Theopaschitians, Apollinarians, etc. The words orthodox and Catholic are therefore better not used as modern party names.—ED., M.C.]

THE SECOND COMING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

Your remarks relating to the correspondence in *The Guardian* about the League of Nations and the Second Coming have prompted me to make a few suggestions.

We make our difficulties, not infrequently, by the phrases we use—phrases which sometimes occur nowhere in Scripture, or perhaps only once. One such phrase is embodied in our Advent Collect, the phrase 'Second coming.' This does not occur in the New Testament, but a somewhat similar expression is used in the Epistle to the Hebrews *once*, where the writer says: 'To them that look for Him, He will appear the second time unto salvation.'

In the Gospels Christ refers often to the Coming of the Son of Man, but the somewhat limiting term 'second' is not used. In the Epistles St. Paul speaks often of His unveiling, using the word 'Presence,' which will be found in the margin of the text where the word coming is used in our translation.

It may be objected that whatever phrase was used the early Church obviously looked for a 'Second coming.' It did certainly, and probably expected the coming to be a manifestation in *visible* form as King and Judge. It is universally recognised that the primitive conception was erroneous, therefore the Church of to-day cannot be tied by the interpretation which the first Christians placed upon their Master's words when He told them to look for the manifestation of His presence. He said that this manifestation would be like the lightning. The simile gives food for reflection. Lightning comes—is manifest in repeated flashes. One could not speak of a first and second coming of lightning. When He was asked *where* His manifestation would be, He replied: 'Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.' In other words—where there is a need for purifying, there My Presence will be manifested, destroying what is corrupt' (St. Luke, xvii, 22-27).

Doubtless the misinterpretations of the disciples affected their record of what their Master said about the Coming of the Son of Man, but in the words I have quoted, and in such words as 'Two women shall be grinding together, the one shall be taken and the other left,' we have indications of teaching concerning the revelation of the Son of Man which have been overlooked; the human mind is apt to ignore what it does not understand and give a crude interpretation to mystical sayings couched in imagery.

My point is that if we keep closer to the language of the New Testament we shall cease to talk about a 'Second' Coming at some distant day, and shall be on the watch for the tokens of a Presence revealed frequently, and more particularly at certain critical periods of history. We shall observe that great cataclysms such as the tremendous war we have lately passed through are the precursors of a new order, a new age. Looking

back over history we shall see that it has been so; looking at the immediate past and the changed conditions of our present world we shall recognise a Presence moving in the chaos and re-creating the Human Race. A new spirit of International Co-operation is manifest in the League of Nations, a new spirit is apparent in the Moslem world—a change is manifest. Is it not a Day of the Lord? Is not the Spirit of Jesus in our midst, a living Presence, influencing the rulers of nations, stirring up among all peoples a spirit of inquiry? Perhaps we do not recognise Him because 'He cometh with clouds'; it may be that we are 'missing a great opportunity—the opportunity of being 'taken' voluntarily and consciously into the fellowship of His purpose; perhaps we may be like the woman of the parable, 'left' grinding at the mill of earth for temporal gains.

H. A. DALLAS.

[Our correspondent raises profound issues in which the Liberals will agree with her interpretation but the Eschatologists will not. We cannot tell for certain whether our Lord did predict His second coming; it is much more certain that He predicted His death and triumph and the overthrow of the Temple. It is quite certain that the early Church believed in His almost immediate return and that the modern-minded Christian does not. Under the circumstances it would be well to eliminate it from our formularies and hymns and to emphasize that for which He taught us to pray, the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth.—ED., M.C.]

SONGS OF PRAISE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

The praise which your reviewer gives our new book is doubly welcome coming from so able and experienced an authority. I am emboldened by his kindness to discuss one or two matters of interest which arise.

(1) We have retained Faber's Trinity hymn; but this easily escapes notice because we have not only put it (in accordance with our system) in the General Section, but have cut out the opening 'worms of earth' verse, so that it now begins with the fine line 'Most ancient of all mysteries.' Faber can sometimes write slop and gush with the worst—his ordinary level is sentimental; but he rises now and then to be like Wordsworth (another unequal writer!); he seems to have, however, a curious difficulty in reaching his better self till after a verse or two; more than once he begins a fine hymn with a weak verse. 'Souls of men, why will ye scatter?' for instance, is feeble even for nineteenth century hymnody (and 'Was there ever kindest Shepherd' is worse): remove the opening gush and you come to the beginning of a fine hymn, 'There's a wideness in God's mercy.' This is the more curious because most hymn-writers begin with a good line or two—an idea has come into their heads—and when they fail it is because they cannot keep up the inspiration; and many who do better fall to pieces in the second or the dangerous third verse. One of the many difficulties in hymn-book making (about which 'H.A.' writes so feelingly) is the danger of the weary searcher being seduced by a promising first line. Some of the bad hymns most difficult to eradicate first found admittance in this way.

(2) Modern hymn-books have shown a good deal of editorial courage in discarding some of the falser and more demoralising hymns. 'A few more years shall roll,' for instance, has appeared in hardly any book of importance during the last twenty years, 'Days and Moments' in only one, and 'The voice that breathed o'er Eden' in none. As 'H.A.' says, *Songs of Praise* has continued the process. It is of urgent importance, for if the Church does not kill the Bad Hymn, the Bad Hymn will kill the Church, I

should personally have liked to be more drastic; but the only safe course is to be guided by committees of advice, since a too 'perfect' hymnal would be used by no one and therefore would do no good. Sometimes the evil can be minimised by the omission of certain verses, such as the 'stony griefs' one: our advisers, for instance, pressed us to retain 'Crown Him with many crowns'; it is mere versified emotion, but in its shortened form it will do little harm.

(3) It is very harassing to be pressed for space, but very salutary. We could have pleased everybody if the publishers had run to another hundred hymns; but the book would not have been as good as it is. If we are to reform our hymnody, we must all make one or two personal sacrifices; and, as 'H.A.' says, we all have a weakness for something bad. The ablest men have generally had a weakness somewhere, due perhaps to long-past nursery reminiscences; but their children do not take after them, and that is the important point.

(4) The children come in a good deal over the 'bloody' hymns. I don't think the present generation of intelligent students, with whom I foregather a good deal, will stand much blood. Theologians hardly realise the shock it causes (a shock which is well described in the Sunday School Festival chapter of 'Clayhanger'): they are so used to mean something quite different. So St. Paul could talk about blood to Jews without being understood literally; but Medieval Christians who had no animal sacrifices, and for whom blood was not tabu, revelled in stories like that of the beast stolen by the Jew, which splashed out blood when he threw it in the fire. The present generation is less capable even than the Middle Ages of understanding the Jewish idea of blood, for it knows the Bible even less in some ways. I find that young people of to-day by 'blood' mean blood, and sometimes ask in perfect good faith awkward questions about cannibalism. They can understand neither the 'evangelical' nor the 'catholic' use of the word; it sometimes simply revolts them, and they think, as Mr. Arnold Bennett does, of naked savages rushing about with knives. No doubt this is unfortunate; but we cannot compel the whole population of Britain to attend a course of lectures on, say, 'The relation between Post-Exilic and Hellenistic Judaism and the theology of Luther and Calvin.' And there is a good deal of atavism about. . . .

(5) This is already a long letter, but I should like to add that space has been sometimes saved in *Songs of Praise* by the omission of pieces which are to be found elsewhere; this applies to the little Sunday Kindergarten songs in *Song Time* and in the Sunday School edition of the *English Hymnal*, and to carols, which Mr. Martin Shaw and I have also tried to supply in another book. There are also one or two pieces in the *English Hymnal* which turned out to be more anthems than hymns; your reviewer has noticed the omission of one of these—Heber's 'O most merciful,' which is an ejaculation of twenty-two words, beautiful when sung by the choir alone to Vaughan Williams' setting of the *Münster Gesangbuch* melody, but easy for the congregation to catch without the words being printed.

With much gratitude, yours very truly,

PERCY DEARMER.

KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

SIR,

Your review of Mr. Dearmer's *Songs of Praise* prompts me to suggest a more united plan of Modernist action in regard to Hymns. Every thoughtful worshipper is more or less conscious of our gravamen. But who takes any step to secure alleviation?

You most truly say that the effects 'of good preaching, stately liturgies—(and I would add 'of scientific education of all kinds')—may be undone by hymns.' *Corruptio optimi pessima*. It would be hard to say which of the two historical Church parties is the chief offender, or whether 'Simeon' or 'Levi' has done most to mislead, retard, and vulgarize by perversion of this great agency. But it must be realized that the cheap and widely-disseminated collections which enshrine the mischief cannot for many years be superseded by men of high ideals. The economic consideration is here paramount, and it is a far cry from *Hymns Ancient and Modern* at 2d. to Dr. Dearmer's *Songs of Praise* quoted in your review at 2s. 6d. Obviously we must deal with our bugbear in some other way.

Now, confining myself to *Hymns A. & M.*, I find that this very popular collection contains no less than 638 hymns good, bad, and indifferent. Surely with such a large field purgation should be practicable in any parish where the men of thought—if only a handful in number—agree to use their influence. The hymns used in service are, or should be, chosen by the incumbent. How easy to equip him with an index of 'Hymns objectionable'—whether as insulting our spiritual instincts and sense of truth, or as embodying rotten exegesis and exploded superstitions, or as merely vulgar and mawkish in expression. Frequently the clergyman would be grateful for the hint, and act accordingly. In most cases it would gradually induce reflexion, and possibly reform. I speak from experience, for in my own pastoral days I made out—after consultation with others—just such a list in the case of *Hymns A. & M.* The choir-master—a really devout, thoughtful man—gladly acquiesced, and the result was the unregretted *quietus* of some hundred offensive pieces.

I think this expurgation was ruled by strict impartiality and regard to truth and dignity of worship. The Tractarian *adokimoi* were sometimes hymns simulating asceticism (No. 9), or endorsing barbarous monkish ideas of the Hereafter (Nos. 51, 52), or they presented a dogmatic soteriology (Nos. 104, 170) itself not always quite free from heresy (*cf.* No. 78.) Or, as in 412, 433, they were based on a New Testament exegesis now exploded. The Evangelical were such as insisted on conscious conversion, or enshrined the narrow Calvinism of Toplady and Cowper. Here, too, an eschatology of impossible character was often pressed, but its basis was usually distorted Scripture texts. Very frequently, as in Nos. 195, 206, 258, 304, 305, the offence centred in an unctuous, self-complacent individualism, enunciated sometimes with vulgar boisterousness.

This method is but a *pis aller*, and alas! in how many worthy hymns one sighs for the reshaping of one verse, one line, maybe one word—as in 'Jesus my husband' (No. 176). Several, indeed, of our best hymns suggest the comparison of rivers running into sand. Who, for example, does not deplore the climaxes of Nos. 73, 169, 185, 210? One day doubtless a Modernist editor will redress such *lâches*; meantime, a sensitive mind can sometimes find solace by evolving a satisfactory variant during a dull or objectionable sermon.

A fifty years' experience has convinced me (1) that the theology of many is really based even more on popular hymns than on A.V. texts; (2) that nevertheless church choirs will sing *anything*, no matter how repulsive or foolish, provided it has a catchy tune. For example, I once preached a harvest thanksgiving sermon in a church where the third collect was followed by Walsham How's beautiful hymn 'To Thee, O Lord, our souls we raise,' sung from end to end, but as an anthem. Ten minutes afterwards it was announced and sung through as Hymn 384. I commented on this *da capo* in the vestry afterwards, but not one of the choir had noticed it!

On the other hand, I can recall the great distress of a poor girl whose soldier brother was blown to bits at Gallipoli, she being impressed with a conviction that life beyond involved a material *bodily* resurrection. 'What ignorance?' Yes; but so long as the clergy patronize such hymns as No. 499, with its description of 'the tired body' lying 'with its feet towards the morn,' and finally reunited to the soul with a 'burst of song,' can such misconceptions surprise us? At Bath Abbey the recent lamented death of the Queen Mother was marked by a performance of this Hymn No. 499; but its marvellous perversions of laws physical and spiritual and its obscuration of the real Christian hope, are usually confined to Easter.

A somewhat strained scrupulosity has lately been expurgating the Old Testament Psalter, though few are unaware that this is not a Christian composition, and is only supplementary to our Faith. Might not attention be more properly called to our own house, and the banalities (or worse) enshrined in the Christian books of psalmody? The offence is alike in point of quantity and quality, and incongruity is perhaps at its most absurd pitch when some quite irrequisite boisterous hymn opens the service, to be immediately followed by such appeals as 'Rend your hearts and not your garments' in deference to the wiser arrangement of the Prayer Book.

Bath.

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

January, 1926.

[Although the pleasantly printed and bound edition of *Songs of Praise* costs 2/6 a volume, there is a cheaper edition which costs only 6d.—ED., M.C.]

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION COUNCIL ELECTION, 1926.

SIR,

I shall be obliged if you will give publicity to the following official notice to members of the Churchmen's Union.

On July 22nd, 1925, the Council decided to substitute 'March' for 'May' in Rule (6) of The Constitution. The effect of this change is that nominations of candidates for election to the Council must now 'reach the Secretary *not later than March 1st.*'

Of the thirty *elected* members of the Council, ten retire each year and are *not eligible for re-election* for one year (though the Council may co-opt not more than six of them). The ten elected members retiring at the annual meeting (June 9th), 1925, are:—Mr. Bass, Mr. Buckley, Miss Ferguson, Mr. Given-Wilson, Dr. Morrison, Dr. Matthews, Mr. Dowding, Canon Rendall, Mr. Russell and Dr. White.

The following were *co-opted* to the Council for the current year, and retire on June 9th, but are *eligible for election*:—Mr. Bagenal, the Hon. Gilbert Coleridge, Major Povah, Mrs. Reith and Mr. Walker. All other members of the Council (whose names are printed on the cover of *The Modern Churchman*) continue to serve.

I hope this is clear. Briefly, the ten *elected* councillors retiring may not be re-elected this year; ten members of the Union must be elected in their stead, and nominations of candidates (proposed and seconded) must reach me by March 1st, after which date, if more than ten nominations are received, voting papers will be sent to all members of the Union.

The Churchmen's Union,

The Church House,

Westminster, S.W. 1.

JOHN H. BENTLEY,

Organizing Secretary.